

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom  
all editorial matters should be addressed.

---

Vol. XXII

JUNE, 1931

No. 132

---

## EDITORIAL

WE publish below the papers of the Conference of German and English theologians held at The Palace, Chichester, in March last. In some cases the papers represent much less than what the reader said; and even where a paper was read just as it stands, it appears here without those verbal amplifications and explanations which accompanied it in the Conference itself. Moreover, it has been impossible to reproduce in these pages the play of discussion and argument which followed each paper, and occupied in fact most of the Conference's working time. We believe, nevertheless, that our readers will find great interest in the study of the material here published, and the appended Report, drawn up by Professor Karl Ludwig Schmidt and Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, will fill up many of the gaps. The reader will be struck by the marked similarity of approach which runs through the series—by the endeavour, common to all alike, to get at the positive doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments which confronts us in the New Testament, and to set that forth as a primary *datum* of Christian thought. And he may well find himself led to the view that, if the conditions for a genuine unity of the Church are ever to be reached, it will be by the kind of attitude to the New Testament here exemplified that the most sure as well as the most rapid progress will be made.

No one who attended the Conference would be willing to write about it without paying a tribute to the Bishop of Chichester and Mrs. Bell, whose hospitality did so much to make the week enjoyable: while the chairmanship of the Bishop, supported as he was by Dr. Dibelius of Berlin, was not a little responsible for its theological value.

Our warmest thanks are due to the Rev. L. Patterson, D.D., who has translated the German papers.



# THEOLOGY

## CONFERENCE OF GERMAN AND ENGLISH THEOLOGIANs

HELD AT THE PALACE, CHICHESTER,  
MARCH 23 TO 28, 1931

### SUBJECT: *CORPUS CHRISTI*

1. THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY IN THE LIGHT OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS. *Prof. D. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Bonn.*
2. CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. *Prof. J. M. Creed, Cambridge.*
3. THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING AS TO FELLOWSHIP. *The Rev. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bt., M.A., Cambridge.*
4. THE CHURCH AS CORPUS CHRISTI:
  - (a) The Fundamental Religious Idea. *The Rev. Canon J. K. Mozley, D.D.*
  - (b) The Nature of the Institutional Expression of the Idea. *Pastor Lic. H. Sasse, Berlin.*
5. THE CHARACTER OF CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTALISM. *The Ven. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Durham.*
6. THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE SACRAMENTS. *Prof. D. W. Stählin, Münster.*
7. THE EUCHARIST IN RELATION TO THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCH. *Prof. C. H. Dodd, M.A., Manchester.*
8. CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND THE BODY OF CHRIST. *The Very Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Dean of Winchester, and V. D. M. O. Bauhofer, Geneva.*



## INTRODUCTION

THE account of the third Conference of German and English theologians, held this year at Chichester, from the 22nd to the 28th of March, requires only a short introduction.

Earlier meetings of the Conference had been held at Canterbury in 1927, and at the Wartburg in 1928. The subjects dealt with at those Conferences were "The Kingdom of God" and "Christology." Reports of those Conferences will be found in *THEOLOGY*, May, 1927, and October, 1928 (*cf. Theologische Blätter*, the same dates). The theme selected for the Chichester Conference was "Corpus Christi."

The following theologians took part in the Conference:

THE RT. REV. G. K. A. BELL, D.D., Bishop of Chichester (Chairman).  
DR. OTTO DIBELIUS, General-Superintendent of the Kurmark, Berlin (Vice-Chairman).

OSKAR BAUHOFFER, Theological Adviser to the International Institute of Social Research at Geneva.

THE REV. CANON J. M. CREED, D.D., Ely Professor of Divinity, the University of Cambridge.

THE REV. C. H. DODD, D.D., Rylands Professor, the University of Manchester.

THE REV. SIR EDWYN HOSKYN, Bt., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

THE REV. CANON J. K. MOZLEY, D.D., St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

THE VEN. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., Archdeacon of Durham.

DR. KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT, Professor of New Testament Theology, the University of Bonn (editor of *Theologische Blätter*).

LIC. HERMANN SASSE, Pastor in Berlin (joint editor of *Christentum und Wissenschaft* and editor of *Das Kirchliche Jahrbuch*).

THE VERY REV. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., Dean of Winchester (editor of *THEOLOGY*).

DR. WILHELM STÄHLIN, Professor of Practical Theology in the University of Münster (Westphalia).

The members of the Conference were the guests of the Bishop of Chichester and Mrs. Bell. They were also entertained by the Principal of the Chichester Theological College and by the Headmaster of Lancing College.



## THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY IN THE LIGHT OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS

BY PROFESSOR D. KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT

I BEGIN with two preliminary remarks, which give at once its specific meaning to this subject: (1) If the word "community" is used as it is in the Bible, it cannot be said that there is also yet another community among men beside the religious community. The community also, of which Jesus speaks, can and may only be understood as religious. This means, if it is more clearly and comprehensively expressed: the community with which we as Christians have to do is nothing else but the *Church*. From this the second preliminary remark follows: (2) If this community means the Church in the teaching of Jesus, it is not a mere teacher or prophet coming before us and proclaiming a new idea about the community, but Jesus the *Messiah*. Church and Messiah interact mutually upon one another.

Jesus takes up the proclamation of the Old Testament prophets, the last of whom, John the Baptist, was His immediate forerunner. John the Baptist points to the day of judgment and repentance. He inveighs against the self-satisfaction and self-assurance of the Jewish people, which is shown above all in the Pharisees, both in their legalism and in their apocalyptic, eschatological hopes: "Begin not to say within yourselves: We have Abraham to our father. For I say unto you: God can raise up from these stones children unto Abraham" (Matt. iii. 9; Luke iii. 8). Jesus preaches the same sermon of judgment and grace as well: "Verily I say unto you: many shall come from the east and the west and sit with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom will be cast out into the darkness" (Matt. viii. 10-12). And what is true of the preaching of Jesus is true also of His work: He heals the servant of the centurion of Capernaum, with whom He has found "such faith" (Matt. viii. 5-13).

Two points have been established by what has been said about the community of which Jesus speaks: (a) The community is not defined in the "popular" sense, even when, yes, and just when, the people is spoken of; for the people as *God's people* is meant. (b) The community is not sociologically defined, even when two or three, who are gathered together, are mainly a sociological fact. The קהל יהוה, the ἐκκλησία is exactly constituted only through *God's call*.



Jesus never sees man outside the community thus understood. He sends the healed leper to the Jewish priest and expressly installs him in this way in the special community of God's people (Mark i. 44). The admonition of the offender must last of all be brought before the ecclesia (Matt. xviii. 17). Here one has always to think of the *synagogue* as the community derived from the Old Testament, which Jesus does not deny, but expressly *affirms*, and which He, and indeed only He, *fulfils*.

The congregation, which is given with Jesus and His disciples, is Israel, just and only Israel, the remnant of Israel, the *Israel of the last days*. This event, which makes up the chief content of the disputed, but in my opinion original, saying of Jesus (Matt. xvi. 18), is not isolated in the history of Jesus. Jesus has drawn out of the mass of the Jewish people a little band, which stands in sharp opposition to the Pharisaic scribes and finally to the whole people, which was hardened. In that which Jesus said and did, the eschatology—viz., that the approaching kingdom of God is determined for the remnant and kernel of God's people—is brought to a point. Jesus pointed to the constitution of a *Jesus—Messiah—Church*. On the one hand, He tried to win the whole people, the whole of Israel, and, on the other, He restricted Himself to His disciples, to the faithful few, to a remnant, which finally stands for the whole of Israel. The question is about the promise and fulfilment, which is mentioned in the Old and New Testaments.

This community is held together through the commandment of love. Such love means self-denial for the neighbour's sake. Such neighbour-love is not the same as the philanthropy which is also demanded in the ancient world, which can be raised up to love of enemies, and has its root in the fact that man ought to be holy to man. When such love of man is the starting-point, then the love of the neighbour is the same as the love of God: we love the divine in our neighbour. On the contrary, in the Old Testament, as also with Jesus (*cf.* Mark xii. 28-34 and parallels), it is a question of a proper double commandment of love: God *and* the neighbour. Man stands before God as obedient. When he overcomes himself by this obedience, he is ready for the neighbour. In so far as man loves his neighbour, he proves his obedience toward God. Thus there is no love of the neighbour without love of God, and *vice versa*. The question which arises, then, for the formation of the community, *how* such love of the neighbour must appear, is simply and cogently answered by "as thyself." Just as John the Baptist translates penitence as the duties of everyday life, through which we order our intercourse with our neighbour, so Jesus points to the fact that we ought to grant to others what we grant to our-



selves. How one loves oneself, we know, so that special teaching should not be needed in this case. In the sermon on the mount it is said: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them, for this is the law and the prophets" (Matt. vii. 12=Luke vi. 32 f.). Such love knows no limits. "Seventy times seven" must a man forgive his brother (Matt. viii. 21 f.). All the same, such love is no mere feeling, no mere sympathy for those who are dear to one. This is also found among the heathen and sinners (Matt. v. 46=Luke vi. 32 f.), and must in the last resort be judged as self-love. Such love is not directed to this or that man, whom we ourselves seek out (*cf.* the parable of the Good Samaritan, Luke x.). Such love, "perfection" and "mercifulness," belongs only to God Himself (Matt. v. 48=Luke vi. 36). Just at this place it is expressed that we need in our acts the grace of God. Paul the Apostle has so expressed the same condition of things: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he who loves his neighbour has fulfilled the law" (Rom. xiii. 8).

Jesus' doctrine of the community, which is to be understood as *ecclesiology*, is, as is shown by individual intimations already given, *Christological* and *sacramental*. We have in mind Jesus' self-designation as Son of Man, and the institution of the Lord's Supper accomplished by Him.

When Jesus referred the prophecy about the *Son of Man* to Himself, He might, in connection with Dan. vii. 9-28, have seen in Himself the Son of Man not only as an individual, but also as *representative* of the people of the saints and of the Most High. He forms and creates this people among men. As the Son of Man so understood, Jesus lives not alone with God and for God, but among disciples, whom He wins for Himself and combines in such a way that they represent the people of God. Thus for Jesus the Son of Man of Daniel is at the same time the *Suffering Servant* of Isa. liii. The thought of obedient devotion is characteristic for their representative as well as for the people of God. In its King and Lord the people of God incarnates itself, and is henceforward bound together into a unity. Explain as we may the origin of the Pauline symbol of the *σῶμα χριστοῦ*, we have at any rate in St. Paul actually the same conception: a *σῶμα* with clear consciousness of the speciality of the *κεφαλὴ* and the task of the *μέλη*. To this also belong the expositions of the Fourth Gospel about the unity of men with one another in Christ, who is one with God.

In the feast of the *last meal* with His disciples all that is made visible in a special way. Here the self-interpretation of Jesus in the sense of Daniel's vision of the Son of Man is brought



to a point. What Jesus accomplished esoterically in the hour of the last meal with His disciples has become, with the separation of the hardened people, a strengthening and visualization of the new community.

When in such a way alone Christ and the Lord's Supper constitute the community of Christians, *Christ* is the necessary *crowning* and at the same time the *foundation* of the whole, in whose name alone we gather and *unite ourselves together*. "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20). The Synoptic Gospels and St. John's Gospel are at one in the emphasis on the *ὄνομα χριστοῦ*, from which the community is derived. In the *name of Christ* men are baptized as Christians, whose communion in baptism experiences for the first time the intimation of the *σῶμα χριστοῦ*, the *ἐκκλησία θεοῦ*.\*

## CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

BY PROFESSOR J. M. CREED

### I

It is possible to regard the collection of writings which make up the New Testament as documents for the "origins of Christianity" the first chapter in the History of the Christian Church. We then make the great structure of "historic Christianity" our mental starting-point, and we proceed to look in the books of the New Testament for the germs of the full-grown organism of the Catholic Church with its organization, its dogmatic system, its sacramental rites. These germs we duly find (compare Loisy *L'Évangile et l'Eglise*).

Another approach to the same New Testament is to regard it as the last chapter in the Bible, the fulfilment of "the hope of Israel."

If we wish to grasp the intrinsic meaning of the New Testament, the latter approach is to be preferred, for it corresponds with the convictions of the apostolic writers themselves. The New Testament perspective is eschatological. The believers live in "the last times." In the Person of Jesus Christ lies the fulfilment of God's ancient promises. When Christ returns,

\* For the idea of the *ἐκκλησία*, as used by Jesus, cp. my monograph, "Die Kirche des Urchristentums, eine lexicographische und biblisch-theologische Studie" (separate reprint from the presentation to Adolf Deissmann, 1927). For the preaching of Jesus see my article, "Jesus Christus" in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, second edition, 1929.



the promised salvation will be visibly revealed, and even in this age it is already in some sense present through the gift of the Spirit which has followed upon the crucifixion and resurrection of the Christ.

Moreover, Catholic Christianity itself lends support to this method of approach and strengthens the case for its own exclusion from the field of vision. The post-apostolic Church was responsible for setting the apostolic writings alongside the Scriptures of the Old Covenant—an idea which, of course, was not entertained by the writers themselves. By this action the Catholic Church showed that it recognized a demarcation—however exactly that demarcation was drawn—between the apostolic foundation and all later building. Strictly speaking, the Apostles left no successors. The subsequent Church thought of itself as guardian of the apostolic tradition. But the Apostles died out. Not even the Pope is an Apostle. The Reformation appeal to unadulterated Scripture is in line with classical Christian theology, and though the later Catholicism felt it necessary to guard the appeal to Scripture by a concurrent appeal to tradition, the appeal to Scripture is not itself disallowed.

While therefore from one point of view biological analogies are appropriate (the Apostles sow a seed which grows into a great tree), from a deeper point of view such analogies must be eschewed (the Apostles preach the approaching Kingdom of God and the return of Christ; the Church guards their teaching).

Thus we are led to maintain that the Christian fellowship of the New Testament is not fellowship in the empirical historic phenomenon of the Church which took its origin in the apostolic preaching—for from the point of view of the New Testament the very existence of "historic Christianity" is something of a problem; rather is it to be thought of as fellowship in Faith as to First and Last Things.

## II

The New Testament reveals a life of intense fellowship, but there appears to be no distinctive teaching about fellowship in itself. St. Paul borrows a well-known Stoic analogy between a body with its members and the life of society. The analogy is not new or distinctive, though, inasmuch as the body is said to be Christ and we His members, the whole conception receives a new mystic meaning and a concrete application. But fellowship in the body of Christ is not to be understood by means of analytic treatment of the empirical fellowship. The empirical fellowship throughout the New Testament looks to and depends upon certain presuppositions.



Three constant factors appear to be present in the New Testament:

1. The Scriptures of the Jewish Church which Jesus is to fulfil, and has already fulfilled.
2. Jesus Christ Himself, His person, character, mission and work.
3. The conviction that the world is passing away and that the Christian believers as the new Israel have already anticipated the new age which lies beyond the judgment and dissolution of this present world.

These three constant factors may be traced in different forms and with varying emphasis in—

1. The primitive Jewish-Christian community at Jerusalem;
2. St. Paul's teaching to the predominantly Gentile community at Corinth; and
3. The Johannine theology.

The concurrent operation of these three factors makes the fellowship of the primitive Church a distinctive and unique phenomenon.

### III

As Christians we are lineally descended from and dependent upon the primitive fellowship. But the primitive fellowship itself has passed out of temporal existence, and the three factors which we found to be operative in that fellowship cannot be *immediately* operative for ourselves.

Christianity must be translated and thought through afresh.

The following are some fragmentary reflections on our present problems arranged under the three heads already mentioned:

#### 1. The Old Testament.

Primitive Christianity started by assuming the Old Testament revelation.

In spite of Marcion and the Gnostics the ancient Church refused to surrender its claims in the Old Testament, and the Old Testament was of great importance to the upstart Faith as securing it historical status, and a grounding in cosmology.

Modern European science and history contested and eventually occupied the position which the Old Testament had secured in the early centuries, and which it did not decisively evacuate until, say, the beginning of the nineteenth century (later in Britain).

That conflict made it necessary for Christian Theology to convince itself and others that Christianity was not necessarily



bound up with the acceptance of Genesis as an authority on cosmology, world history, etc.

The virtual abandonment of the old orthodoxy (except in some deliberately reactionary movements) leaves Theology in a new position. The Jewish element, no longer a clog upon independent thought, is found again to have positive value as securing the foundation of the Christian religion in history and in prophetic Theism. The "Hebrew old clothes" (Carlyle) may be regarded as a sacramental vesture which guarantees the reality of "the flesh" of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was as real as the Pharisees.

## 2. The Person of Jesus Christ.

The difficulties raised by Gospel criticism have encouraged a natural reaction from the idea of a return to "the Jesus of History." English students will welcome light on the Barthian doctrine of the human *incognito* of Jesus Christ. Is it right to suppose that this is partly motivated by the desire to secure at all costs the transcendence of God? And perhaps partly by the wish to escape the embarrassments of historical criticism? To some of us who are outsiders it seems a "heady" doctrine. When all is said and done, Christianity did issue from, and centre in, a real historical personality, who left a recognizable impression in the historic order. The historical problems are only felt to be important because this was so. But they are rightly felt to be important. The quality and character of the Christian fellowship is determined by the person Jesus Christ, who really lived and died in the historical world.

## 3. Eschatology. Again a new situation.

The traditional exegesis found ways of getting round the sayings which speak of the immediacy of the Kingdom.

For a later theology, at once emancipated from acceptance of the letter of Scripture and more matter-of-fact in its dealing with texts, eschatology tends to be an otiose survival from Judaism.

From yet another point of view New Testament eschatology is recognized as a thought form which, as it stands, we cannot appropriate. Yet in the New Testament we may see that it serves an essential purpose and secures a vital truth, i.e. it secures belief in the immediacy of the Kingdom of God—which immediacy itself conditions and creates the life of the empirical Christian fellowship.

Christian fellowship is fellowship in Faith as to First and Last Things, mediated by a common relationship to a Person.



## THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING AS TO FELLOWSHIP

BY SIR EDWYN HOSKYNs

IN the New Testament *The Fellowship* is not a title of the Christians. The descriptive title is normally *The Church* or *The Church of God*. Nevertheless, it is assumed that the Christians are or ought to be bound together with one another by ἀγάπη. This unity has, however, a very peculiar occasion, and the words κοινωνία, κοινωνεῖν, κοινωνός are pressed by the New Testament writers to emphasize this occasion rather than to denote merely the fact of Christian fellowship. Thus κοινωνία is defined by the genitive τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (2 Cor. xiii. 13) or simply πνεύματος (Phil. ii. 1), and the verb has for its object τοῖς πνευματικοῖς (Rom. xv. 27). It would, however, be to misunderstand this teaching if we were to think of the New Testament fellowship as a spiritual fellowship or primarily as a union of men and women which was the result of a creative action of the Spirit of God. It is this, of course; but the action of the Spirit of God is itself conditioned by a relationship or fellowship with the Son of God: "God is faithful, through whom ye were called into fellowship with His Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord" (1 Cor. i. 9). This is not another manner of describing a spiritual fellowship. St. Paul's language calls up the peculiar historical background which is the immediate and necessary occasion both of the fellowship with the Holy Spirit and of the fellowship of the Christians with one another. That this is so is shown by the way in which St. Paul rivets the whole reality of Christian unity to a fellowship with the sufferings of Christ: "In order that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed to His death, of by any means . . ." (Phil. iii. 10). The ground of belief in the possibility of sharing in the Resurrection of the Dead is thrust back upon a present sharing or fellowship in the sufferings of Christ (cf. 1 Peter iv. 13, 2 Cor. i. 7). That St. Paul regards this relationship with the Jesus of history as the only true foundation of the life of the Church is shown by the roughness of the language in which he tries to discipline the whole conception of Fellowship. The Christian *Khabura*, or *Kiddush*, or *thanksgiving*, or whatever we may call it, in order to bring out its Jewish rather than its Greek background, is not necessarily a thanksgiving for the creation of the world, or for the rescue of the Hebrew people from Egypt. It is the fellowship with the Blood of Christ; it is fellowship with the Body of Christ. Nor is this a mere lapse into mysticism. St. Paul holds the whole life of the Church to



that obedience to the will of God in flesh and blood which had its origin in Jesus of Nazareth and which was completed in His Death. This is the fulfilment of the Old Testament Scriptures, and there can be no true fellowship which is not grounded upon the control of the death of the Christ. The necessity of the history is similarly brought out in Hebrews ii. 14, 15.

This sense for the peculiar occasion of Christian *ἀγάπη* explains the other uses of the word "fellowship." The Apostles were the witnesses to Jesus, hence the author of Acts describes the Church in Jerusalem as abiding steadfastly in the teaching of the Apostles, and, consequently, in fellowship (Acts ii. 42). The Christian fellowship is a fellowship *in the gospel* (Phil. i. 5); it is a fellowship *in faith* (Phm. 6). The whole sequence of thought which underlies St. Paul's teaching is admirably illustrated in 1 John i. 3-7. The author is moving in terms of fellowship, and seems to be protesting against the use of the word to denote a spiritual fellowship uncontrolled by belief that Jesus had come in flesh. He first says that the Christians have fellowship with the original disciples whose hands handled and whose eyes saw the Word of God which was manifested to them. Then he asserts that the fellowship of the original disciples was with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ. Then he emphatically and dogmatically states that fellowship with God involves that righteousness—walking in light not in darkness—which results from the purification from sin by the blood of Jesus.

Two questions arise from this very peculiar usage of the word "fellowship." Is it all due to the influence of St. Paul? It may be, of course. But the question is rather whether this pulling back of the whole conception of human fellowship to its only true ground in the present obedience to the will of God by faith in God through Christ is not the result of a genuine insight into the meaning of the Life and Death of Jesus, and into the meaning of His Resurrection as the ratification by God of the obedience of His Son. The primitive Christians tended to lapse into a mystical fellowship or into a mere companionship, and the work of the theologians in the New Testament was to prevent this subtle destruction of the Gospel.

The second question is concerned with the relation of all this to the teaching Jesus. There is in His recorded teaching no emphasis upon fellowship, just as there is no emphasis upon the present possession of the Spirit by His disciples. The Gospels present the isolated obedience of Jesus, the Messiah, to the Father—an obedience wrought out to the end in His Death. The new order lies in the future, and for this reason the interest of the evangelists is concentrated upon the teaching and actions of Jesus, and not upon their result.



## THE CHURCH AS CORPUS CHRISTI

### THE FUNDAMENTAL RELIGIOUS IDEA

BY CANON MOZLEY, D.D.

THE peculiar relation of the Church to Christ, which underlies and to some extent explains the controversies arising out of problems of Church-order, can be understood if we compare that relation with what is normally true of the ties between a religious or philosophical leader and his followers after the leader's death. They feel themselves still bound to him by feelings of affection and gratitude; he has a foremost place in their memories; they are conscious of the continued inspiration of his teaching, of the ideals for which he stood; they resolve that what they call "his spirit" shall be kept alive; if they hold that death is not the end of a man's existence they may believe that in a deeper sense his spirit is indeed alive and has invisible contacts with them; they contemplate the perpetuation of his memory and the confirming of his influence by the foundation of some institution in which his distinctive teachings will continue to be heard or his counsels for the welfare of mankind worked out in practice. If he has written much, his works may be collected into some great and worthy edition, and men will speak of the "Corpus," the body of his philosophy or religious teaching. In such ways the grievous loss which his death meant will, to some extent, be lessened. Though he now belongs, as we say, to the past, efforts will be made to see that he is not forgotten in the present, and that he shall not be ignored in the future.

What we have in this case is the sight of disciples carrying on the tradition of a teacher. A great Rabbi has died: but as he taught the truth with convincing power, now, in every way that is possible, it must be as though he had not died. Where his teaching still is given, there, in some sense, he himself will be. As to how much such a thought carries with it, there will be differences even within the circle of his closest disciples.

When one turns from some other great teacher and the events which have followed in the train of his death to Jesus Christ and the continuance of His influence in the world, certain connections are immediately visible. Much that has been said above will still apply. There are disciples actuated by a like feeling of loyalty and devotion; there is the determination that He and His message shall not be forgotten; there is the belief in abiding spiritual contact between Him and



His followers. But these resemblances, real and important though they are, must be regarded as quite subsidiary to the differences which now come to be considered.

These differences turn upon two beliefs which the disciples of Jesus, who had been crucified, soon held with the complete assurance that their faith was grounded in facts which revealed the special activity of God. They believed that God had raised Jesus from the dead, and that Jesus risen and exalted had poured out His Spirit upon His disciples.

Two results followed: first, the disciples were now convinced beyond the possibility of further doubt that Jesus was the Messiah and that in Him alone were the hopes of the people of God to be fulfilled; secondly, the outpouring of the Spirit upon the disciples meant that from then onwards they were united in a special way. They were not describable simply as disciples or believers on Jesus, bound together, however closely, as individuals by the fact of the faith in Jesus which each of them possessed. But they were a body unified through the coming upon them, when they were "altogether," of the Spirit, inevitably identified by them with the Spirit of Jahveh whose outpouring was foretold in Joel's prophecy, but so closely associated with Jesus that Jesus could be spoken of as the Giver.

Thus, the Resurrection and Pentecost led to the conception of a unity of a particular character existing between Jesus the Messiah, the Spirit, and the body of believers. From this standpoint one can understand the Johannine comment, "for the Spirit was not yet, for Jesus was not yet glorified." Not till after the Passion and the Resurrection could the Spirit be thought of as the Spirit of Jesus or of Christ. It was in the Passion and the Resurrection that the disciples came to the full assurance of the Messiahship of Jesus; the Cross which had been the great stumbling-block was seen in the light of the Resurrection as the place where the full meaning of the Messiahship was given, so that the believer did not hold to the fact of the Messiahship less firmly but more firmly as he looked to Calvary. And the Spirit whom the exalted Jesus sent He sent not as Teacher, but, in the language of Acts, as Prince and Saviour. The significance of the confession that Jesus is the Christ draws for its fullness upon Pentecost just as it draws upon Calvary and upon Easter.

At Pentecost the disciples gained new and transforming knowledge of the Spirit; but they also gained new and transforming knowledge of themselves. All the consequences were not seen at once, but it only needed the course of history to make them visible. The enlightening fact was the refusal of Israel as a whole to accept Jesus as the Christ. Israel in doing so



forfeited its right to be any longer, as the nation, the People of God. But that did not and could not mean that there was no People of God; so sacred a conception as that could not be discarded. Only one conclusion did justice to the facts—that the body of believers was the true Israel or People of God.

With that identification there comes a further stage in the realization of the importance of the Christian Ecclesia. Under the old covenant the supreme relation was that which existed between Jahveh and, not the individual Israelite, but Israel. The individual had his place within that relation as a member of the People of the covenant. While the sense of the importance of the individual was to increase, that was not at the expense of the fundamental notion of the religious relation as one between Jahveh and His People. To the old covenant succeeded the new covenant sealed in the death of the Messiah; to that covenant Israel as a nation was never a consenting party; but that involved no abandonment of the thought of a covenant-people; the new covenant was not to be one whose validity depended upon a number of individual relations. On the contrary, it would be true to say that the Messiah in giving His life a ransom for many brought into existence a covenant-people. So St. Paul was to speak of the Church of God "which He purchased with His own blood." Such a conception goes far beyond anything that could have had a place in the history of the first covenant. And if it was at Sinai that Israel became a kingdom of priests and holy nation, titles not less significant would befit that Church which was the fruit of Calvary and was endowed with the Spirit from on high at Pentecost. Any view of the Church which represents it as an element of secondary importance in Christianity is shattered by the fact that the Church under the new dispensation is the equivalent, one might say the antitype, to Israel, the nation under the old. Rather should one frame some such canon as this: "Whatever was true of the religious value, in its relation to God, of Israel after the flesh, that and much more is true of the new Israel, the Church." Confirmatory of this is the universalizing of the Old Testament idea of the holy nation by the bringing in of Gentiles on equal terms with Jews and the substitution for a centre of gravity in the future (Brunner's description of the Messianic character of the Old Testament) of a centre of gravity in the present, resulting from the advent of the Messiah in the Person of Jesus.

It is this, with the full weight of the great facts of the Passion, the Resurrection, and Pentecost, which is finally determinative of the religious conception of the Church. The relation between the Church and Jesus the Messiah was of such a nature that not



even the relation between Israel and Jahveh afforded a real parallel. For Jahveh was not present in Israel in the way in which Jesus was present by His Spirit in His Church. Jahveh proclaimed His righteousness by His prophets and in His law; with the coming of Jesus there is more than proclamation. Perhaps I may try to express the difference in some words of my own written a long time ago: "The whole ethic of Christ's life, His words and works and Cross, represents and is God's own righteousness. . . . It is, of course, of the greatest value to see in Christ's life the ideal for man; but it should be remembered that that is not simply because He is perfect Man, but because, since He is God as well as man, He reveals the truth about God's moral Being, reveals it by word, but still more by action and suffering, by life and by death." To this the Church was and remains the indispensable witness—but a witness of a quite unique character. For the Church's witness to Christ is not to be compared with the testimony which someone gives who may have only a casual concern with that to which he testifies, no relation except that of a stranger to someone to whom he testifies. But the Church's witness to Christ is the reverse of all this, for the Church is altogether committed in this matter. If its witness is false, then in the end the Church must die; but if it is true it is so because the secret of the Church's life, which is at the same time the power of its true testimony, is to be found in the voice of the Spirit speaking through the Church's words. There is no true witness to Jesus apart from the Spirit; it is only in the Holy Ghost that the Church can confess Jesus as Lord; and the Spirit speaking in the Church is the Spirit of Jesus. The witness of the Church to Christ is at the last the witness of Christ to Himself through His Spirit. And what does that mean, except that, as St. Paul expressed it, the Church is the Body of Christ? That is the final, the last reached truth about the Church; and when it is reached it is seen to be fundamental.

This exposition of what seems to be involved in the thought of the Church as the Body of Christ is not, of course, intended to be an account of the way in which that remarkable concept came into existence. There is nothing here which need clash with the suggestions as to the origin of the phrase made by Archdeacon Rawlinson in his illuminating article in *Mysterium Christi*. He writes with a wealth of knowledge in the fields of New Testament scholarship to which I can make no claim; but from another angle of study all that he says as to the significance of the title as given to the Church is fully borne out.

In conclusion, I wish to draw out the most important conse-



quences which immediately follow from this notion of the Church as the Body of Christ.

"If any man is in Christ he is a new creation." With the idea of the new creation goes the idea of transcendence; that is part of the meaning which attaches to the description of the believer as "the Lord's free-man." His absolute dependence upon the Lord brings with it an independence of the world. But such transcendence cannot be understood as a fact of the individual life alone. The true *vis-à-vis* to the world regarded as a complex of relations and institutions organized apart from any reference to the will of God is not this or that individual Christian, or any number of them conceived of individually, but the Body of Christian disciples, the Church. The Church transcends the world because it is the body in which the Spirit of Christ dwells. It is not of the world even as Christ is not of the world. And just as Christ's appeal to the world is not based on His likeness to that which the world can recognize as the noblest form of its own life (as would be the case if He really came within the category of the heroes), but on His transcending such forms and offering Himself as Lord and Saviour, so that which matters most about the Church is that it, precisely, is not one among many institutions dependent for their being and well-being upon the general character of the world's life. It is in its difference from the world that the Church's right and power of evangelization lie. The Church can work upon the world because its Spirit is the Spirit which is from God, the Holy Spirit whom the Church knows as the Spirit of Jesus the Christ. So, in the life and work of the Church two truths are inseparable; first, the Church is wholly dependent upon Christ: where that dependence is being in any way forgotten within the Church, there the Church is assimilating itself to a worldly institution; secondly, in the authority of the Church the authority of Christ is present within the world-order, while in a relation of transcendence of the world-order, which may, at any time, become sharp opposition to it.

It is in this connection that we can understand the Church's proclamation of other-worldly ends, what its critics would blame as its overemphasis upon eschatology. Because the Church is not a kingdom of this world, it is not directly concerned with this-worldly ends, and, therefore, has no direct authority in relation to them. The one proper concern of the Church in its *kerugma* is the Kingdom of God and all that directly appertains to it. The Church which is the Body of the Messiah, the King who was crucified, does not exist in order to proclaim or bring in an earthly Paradise. It in no way follows from this that the Church will be indifferent to the achievement of



this-worldly ends. Transcendence does not mean indifference either in God or in Christ or in the Church. On the contrary, the life of the world in all its parts is bound to be affected by the Church's preaching of the Gospel, since it is within the sphere of the life of this world, though not directed to it as to its proper end, that the ethic of the Gospel applies. And the Church which gives its message also gives itself in sacrificial service. In no other way is there so clear a manifestation of the Church as Christ's Body, the fullness of Him who all in all is being fulfilled.

In conclusion, I should like to draw attention to one result which seems to me to follow from this great title "*Corpus Christi*," which is given in the Apostolic Age to the Church. There are a great many people today who are interested in Jesus; they study the historic figure and evaluate His genius. Stories are written to give an imaginative reconstruction of the sort of thing which might have happened to Him after His crucifixion, if Christian belief had been right to this extent that Jesus did not die upon the Cross. Along with this can go a complete disbelief in that which Jesus thought of as really mattering, namely God, and His own relation to God. To all this dissection, admiration, criticism, delight in, and, I should say, even love of the human Jesus the Church presents a continual obstacle, not so much by its counter-criticism as by the fact of its life. Whatever its critics may make of the Church it stands like a rock in the way of all attempts that are made to produce the conviction that the one true knowledge of Christ is the knowledge of Him "after the flesh," that is (I am not entering into the question of what St. Paul exactly meant), the knowledge of the life and character of a human Jesus. And the Church's assurance rests ultimately not on this or that particular argument, but on its conviction which is its deepest self-knowledge that the indwelling source of its life is the Spirit of Christ, and that, for the Spirit and so for Christ Himself, it furnishes and is the Body.

---

## THE CHURCH AS CORPUS CHRISTI

BY HERMANN SASSE

WHEN the Church is designated as the body of Christ in St. Paul's Epistles, that is a thought for which every parallel is wanting in the history of religion. The Church of the N.T. can be compared with the congregation (people) of Islam or with



the congregation of Buddha; parallels can be drawn between the hellenistic congregations of the Pauline period and the associations of the hellenistic mystery religions. In that way remarkable sociological affinities result. But neither the relation of a band of disciples to their master nor the relation of a believing community to its founder, nor the relation of a mystery guild to its cult-god was capable of being designated by an expression which would even only approximately correspond to the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* of the N.T. The singularity, in the history of religion and sociology, of the *ἐκκλησία* of the N.T. finds in its designation as the body of Christ its classical expression. But while the N.T. utters this peculiar thought, it avails itself naturally of an already existing world of ideas and terminology. It is above all worth while to know these presuppositions of thought and language, if we wish to understand the idea of the Corpus Christi. We can only here indicate what is most important.

The first presupposition is the thought that a community of men can be understood as *σῶμα* in the sense of an organism. "We many are one body" (1 Cor. x. 17). "As the body is one and has many members, but all the members of the body, though they are many, are only one body" (1 Cor. xii. 20). "As we have many members in one body, but not all members have the same work, even so we, the many, are one body . . . , and every one members in their reciprocal relation" (Rom. xii. 4 f.). A plurality of members of different kinds and with different functions exists in the unity, the wholeness of the body, whereby the whole is more than the sum of the parts. Only in the relation to the whole of the body and to one another the members have their existence. They are not there for themselves. Even their functions are related to one another and are functions of the body (1 Cor. xii. 14 ff.). Between the members, which can only exist with and for one another, there exists the relation of *συμπαθεία* (*συμπάσχει*, 1 Cor. xii. 26). These thoughts are intelligible without any commentary. As they have been set forth here—viz., with the omission of Christ's name—they contain nothing specifically Christian. We find in them the hellenistic thought of the organism, as it was developed in the classical philosophy of the Greeks and was disseminated by the later popular philosophy (cp. the Platonic doctrine of the State as a collective person, the Aristotelian doctrine of the superiority of the society to the individual, the Stoic thought of the organism of the world or (in Cicero and Seneca) of the society bound together into unity through the *συμπαθεία τῶν ὅλων*). St. Paul has borrowed the widespread image of the body, with the help of which the essence of human communities was made clear, from



the storehouse of the thought of his time and applied it to the Church.

The second presupposition is the thought of the spirit constituting the community, an Oriental, not a Greek thought. It is emphasized again and again that it is the *πνεῦμα* which creates the unity of the *σῶμα*. "One body and one spirit" (Eph. iv. 4). "We are all baptized through one spirit into one body, whether we be Jews or Greeks, slaves or free men, and are all made to drink of one spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 13). Even this thought is not specifically Christian, but it belongs to the prophetic religions of the East. The Pneuma, the Spirit of God coming upon men from above and dwelling in them, binds the individuals together into a unity, a "we," a collective person of the true people or the congregation. The community so understood is something else than that which is meant by the Greek doctrine of the organism. It is, if the words may be used, a "supernatural," not a "natural" community. In this sense the great religious communities of the East, founded on revelation, have been understood. The historically most significant example of this outside Judaism and the Church is the "people," the congregation, of Islam. On Christian ground the Oriental idea of the Church as the collective person constituted through the Pneuma has maintained itself most clearly in the Churches of the East (cp. the "we," the *πιστεύομεν* in the Eastern confessions in contrast with the Western *credo*, further the doctrine of the infallibility of the collective person of the whole Church represented in the Œcumenical Council in contrast with the Roman doctrine of infallibility; to the Eastern theory of Catholic truth belongs the corresponding doctrine of Mohammed: "My people will never consent to an error!").

The thoughts of the community as a *σῶμα*, an organism, and of the Pneuma constituting the community, form the presupposition for the N.T. conception of the Church as the Corpus Christi, and indeed the thought of the Pneuma stands in the first place. St. Paul gives these thoughts a fully new content, when he asserts the following: (1) The Pneuma constituting the Church as a community is the Holy Ghost; (2) The *σῶμα* constituted through the Holy Ghost is the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*.

The first of these sentences means that not all Pneuma is identical with the Holy Spirit of God. The N.T. would frankly recognize that there are also other spiritual communities, collective persons (1 Cor. x. 20 f.), in so far as other communities could broadly appropriate the utterances of St. Paul about the Pneuma constituting the community. The only question is, what kind of a Pneuma it is which constitutes these other communities. Here we come upon the distinction



characteristic for biblical religion between the Pneuma in itself and the Holy Spirit of God and between the spirit of falsehood and the spirit of truth. On this fundamental distinction rests the self-limitation of the biblical faith in God against all religions which come forward with the claim to possess prophecy and revelation. This distinction, already existing in the O.T. in the distinction of true and false prophecy, is so completed in the N.T. that the criterion for the testing of the spirits, "whether they are of God," is found in this, whether they bear witness to Jesus as Christ come in the flesh (1 John iv. 1 ff.) and as the Lord (1 Cor. xii. 3). The witness of the Holy Spirit is always witness of Christ, whether it be of him that comes as in O.T. and N.T. prophecy (John xvi. 13), or of him who is come in the flesh (John xv. 26). Christ and the Holy Spirit belong together. They are not identified, but are thought of as coexistent: *Ubi Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Christus; ubi Christus, ibi Spiritus Sanctus*. The presence of the Holy Spirit in the *ἐκκλησία* is therefore not to be thought of without the real presence of the crucified and exalted One. In the light of this presence of the Lord and the Spirit the Church is to be understood: *Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia* (Ignatius); *ubi Spiritus Sanctus ibi ecclesia* (Irenæus). If one asks about the Church, one may not first put the question, "Where are the men who belong to the Church?" but one must ask, "Where is Christ, where is the Holy Ghost?" and the answer to this can only be: Christ is really present in the word of the gospel and in the sacrament; the Holy Spirit is really given (*ubi et quando Deo est visum*) through the word and the sacrament. Where the gospel and the sacraments are, there men are called into the Church, there comes into being the congregation of the saints, i.e., of the justified sinners—a community not to be understood by means of sociology. Within this congregation there exists what the Apostolicum calls the *communio sanctorum* and what is called in the N.T. *κοινωνία*, community in the sense of shareholding. The members of the congregation share in the same Christ and the same Spirit (1 John i. 3; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Phil. ii. 1) and stand therefore in the relation of *κοινωνία* to one another. Christ dwells "through faith" in their hearts (Eph. iii. 17, cp. Gal. ii. 20, where the "in faith" is likewise to be noticed). So the many become a unity, "one single new man" (Eph. ii. 15), the collective person of the Church. Through the "I in them," they are "perfect in unity" (John xvii. 23).

Now St. Paul designates the community of the Church created through the Holy Spirit as *σῶμα* and applies to it in the parable of the body and the members the thought of the community as an organism. It could be asked whether the



thought of the organism, taken from natural life, is generally applicable to the spiritual community of the Church. It is applicable within the same limits as (let us say) the idea of the people. The designation of the Church as a body is exactly so far metaphor as its designation as "people," and in the same way more than a metaphor—viz., an indication of a real relation, as it is not only a metaphor, but a reference to a reality, when we call the Church "people," "people of God." The application of the image of "body" to the Church would present no problem if St. Paul only said of the collective person of the Church constituted through the presence of the Lord and the Spirit what we read in Rom. xii. 5: "So we, the many, are one body in Christ." How, then, is the transition from the expression "body in Christ" to the other "body of Christ," which we find in the exposition of 1 Cor. xii., agreeing in thought with Rom. xii., to be explained? If one cannot comfort oneself with the too convenient explanation that St. Paul was not a keen thinker, and that his mystical language dispenses with strict logic, then there remains no other explanation but the assumption that St. Paul, in what he says about the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, quite consciously combines two originally different thoughts: the thought of the *ἐκκλησία* as the *ἐν σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ* and that of the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, the body of the exalted Lord. Dr. Rawlinson\* has rightly drawn attention to the puzzle of the expression *Corpus Christi* and to the sacrament, especially the Lord's Supper, as the probable starting-point of the thought of St. Paul about the body of Christ. Both ideas of the body of Christ, which is present in the Lord's Supper, and of the one body, which the Church represents, so coincide in 1 Cor. x. 16 f., that one can speak of an identification of both. The Church is the body of Christ, is identical with the body of Christ, which is really present in the Lord's Supper. The participation in the body and blood of Christ present in the Lord's Supper is synonymous with membership in His body. How seriously St. Paul takes this relation between the Church and the glorified body of Christ may be concluded from the fact that he designates the bodies of the faithful, which indeed must be changed into the same form as the glorified body of the Lord (Phil. iii. 21), as members of Christ (1 Cor. vi. 15). But if this interpretation of St. Paul's thought is right, must not one then speak of an identification of the Church with Christ? The question is on this account to be denied, because in spite of the occasional abbreviation "Christ" instead of "body of Christ" (e.g., 1 Cor. xii. 12), a distinction is always made between Christ and His body. That

\* *Mysterium Christi*, p. 225 f.



is clear in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians: Christ remains the "Head" (e.g., Col. i. 18), the Saviour (Eph. v. 23) of His body, and the relation between Him and the Church is understood as the prototype of marriage (Eph. v. 22 *f.*). The collective person of the Church constituted through the Holy Ghost is not Christ. Not "Christ existing as congregation," as has been said, but Christ in His congregation and His congregation in Him, that is the sense of the Pauline doctrine of the Church as the Corpus Christi. Its significance for dogmatics lies in this—that, like no other utterance about the Church which we find in the N.T. it expresses the fact that the essence of the Church can only be understood in the light of Christology, and that means only in the light of faith in Christ.

## THE CHARACTER OF CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTALISM

BY THE VEN. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D.

SACRAMENTS, in the most general sense of the term, may be defined as physical acts, concerned with sensible objects, through the due performance of which, in a religious context, it is believed that some spiritual benefit accrues, or some spiritual result is effected, within the spiritual life of a human being or of human beings. As thus broadly defined, sacraments are in no way peculiar to Christianity. As Professor A. E. Taylor remarks, "many other religions possess sacraments of some kind," though there is none which "possesses the same kind of conscious sacramental theory" as Christianity.\* The attempts which in modern times have been made to discredit the sacramentalism of Christianity by drawing pointed attention to pagan parallels rest, for the most part, upon two quite illegitimate procedures. On the one hand, the actual outward resemblances have been set in a misleading or question-begging light by means of the device of describing the pagan usage in terms which, because they are proper to Christianity, carry with them Christian associations—as when, for example, a pagan religious meal is described as a "eucharist" or "holy communion," or a pagan lustration with water or blood as a "baptism"; on the other hand, the converse device has been adopted—the Christian rite has not seldom been interpreted in the terms of a crudely pagan theology, derived by analogy from what has been conjecturally supposed to have been the

\* A. E. Taylor, *The Faith of a Moralist*, vol. ii., p. 285.



significance of the sacraments of paganism, while the Christian theory of sacraments, in the various forms in which it has been actually held and taught in the Church, has been virtually ignored.

The fundamental idea which lies behind Christian interpretations of the sacraments is that they are essentially manifestations of the divine grace. They require, for their adequate understanding, to be set in the context of the Gospel. They are "means of grace" which proceed wholly from the free, unconstrained and redemptive initiative of the love of God. The theology which they presuppose is a Christian theology—a theology, therefore, which is theistic, and not pantheistic or (what comes, in the end, to the same thing) polytheistic; a theology which affirms at once the transcendence of God over His creation, and His free, redemptive activity in and through history; which holds firmly to the idea of the divine initiative, and which conceives of the divine nature in free, living and personal terms. A sacrament, conceived as being a "means" of divine "grace," is, in the context of such a theology, essentially an act through which "God gives something to man," and (as Professor Taylor has pointed out) it is thereby removed, once and for all, out of the category and domain of the "magical."

If I may quote further the same writer, just as "there is no 'magic'" in the sacraments, so also "there is, for the same reason, no materialism. The sacramental act is, indeed, performed by contact with bodily objects, but it is never held that the bodies employed have any intrinsic efficacy to produce the effect of the sacrament. No theologian, to my knowledge, has ever held that wheaten flour and wine have in themselves any intrinsic efficacy in conferring on him who partakes of them 'remission of sins and all other benefits of the Passion'; they are not analogous to the ambrosia and nectar of classical fables. It has always been held that if their reception is instrumental to these effects, it is so simply by virtue of divine appointment, and that God might, had He pleased, have conjoined the same benefits with different instruments, or produced them without any physical instrument at all. . . . The whole of the instrumental efficacy actually ascribed to them is assumed to be freely conferred on them by the divine volition. References to 'materialistic magic' thus misrepresent the true character of the objection they are intended to convey, and should be dismissed from serious self-respecting argument."\*

The "real question at issue," as Professor Taylor points out, is the question "whether it is incompatible with a rational

\* A. E. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 292 *et seq.*



conception of God to hold that certain specific things and acts may be, not from an intrinsic necessity grounded in their character as these particular physical things and acts, but by free divine appointment, channels or vehicles of a specific contact between the divine spirit and the created."\* There is, indeed, no gainsaying the fact that there exists, in the modern world, a widespread prejudice against any such notion: but it is at least arguable that the prejudice in question proceeds, in the long run, at least in part, from that false spirituality which (ignoring the fact that the life of man in this world is the life, not of a discarnate, but of an embodied, intelligence) would seek to minimize (not in the sphere of religion alone) the part which is normally played by the body, and by "physical occasions" in general, as instruments affecting, or as ministering to, the life of the soul. It is the deliberate judgment, certainly, of multitudes of Christians that the sacraments of the Christian Church are, by divine appointment, normal and regular media and instruments of the divine grace; and it is their conviction, not merely that such a faith is in no way irrational, but that it is confirmed by the witness of spiritual experience in the present and in the past,† no less than by the *auctoritas* at once of the New Testament and of Christian tradition.

I have used the phrase "by divine appointment"; and, from the point of view of theology, this phrase is important. It is in the concrete context of Christianity, considered as an historical and positive religion, that the Christian sacraments alone have significance. Their "necessity" is not deducible *a priori*: and there is even a certain apparent arbitrariness and contingency about the particular forms which in fact they have assumed. Thus, for example, memories of the Last Supper, and of the actions and sayings which in the Gospel tradition are ascribed to the Lord Jesus on that occasion, have, as a matter of actual historical fact, served to determine, in large measure, the significance which, in the "Great Church" of history, has been ascribed to the primitive Jewish and Christian rite of "breaking bread" with religious thanksgiving; and the Eucharist, considered as a sacrament of the Church, finds, in this sense, in the Last Supper its historical sanction. It has been generally believed in the Church that the Lord Jesus, on that particular occasion, explicitly *intended* all this, that the words "This do in remembrance of Me" were, in a literal sense, spoken by Him, and that He was deliberately

\* *Op cit.*, p. 295.

† On the difficulties, nevertheless, which are inherent in any at all rough-and-ready appeal to the witness of spiritual experience (or to the argument from results), and on the cautions to be observed in any attempt to make use of it, see A. E. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 311 *et seq.*



"instituting" a sacrament for future observance. To ask whether, in actual fact, this was so, is to ask a question with regard to which individual historical judgments will differ and to raise, therefore, an issue with regard to which debate and discussion must be to a large extent idle. It is at least equally idle to ask whether, if the course of history had been other than it has actually been, a sacrament might not conceivably have arisen out of something quite different—for example, out of the Johannine story of the feet-washing, which came eventually to play a part in the traditional Holy Week ceremonies of the Latin-speaking part of the Church, but which yet never actually gave rise to a sacrament. Things are what they are, and the course of history has been what it has been; and speculation with regard to the conceivable "might-have-beens" of history is futile. It is by no means needful to accept at its face value in particular cases the traditional "foundation-story,"\* in order to recognize that, in the providence of God, a specific group of rites (of which Baptism and the Eucharist stand first in importance)† came to be acknowledged within the Church as being "sacraments" through which God was pleased to bestow graces and spiritual gifts upon such as rightly received them. The judgment, no doubt, which endorses positively the Church's conviction in this regard must be, of necessity, a judgment of faith: but such a judgment, once made, must carry with it the conviction that the Spirit was rightly guiding the mind of the Church; that the emergence and recognition of this particular group of rites as "sacramental," however *historically* contingent, was not (from a *theological* point of view) accidental; that there is indeed a broad sense in which it may be said with truth that the Church's recognized sacraments convey grace by the appointment and ordinance of God.

It is to be remembered that, when we are speaking of sacraments, in the proper, traditional sense of that word, we are

\* Thus, for example, in the case of Baptism, the belief that the Church, in baptizing converts, was being truly led to fulfil the mind of Christ "after the Spirit" is wholly compatible with a due measure of scepticism as to the precise historical basis of the story in Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

† It should be noticed, however, that of the so-called "lesser sacraments" Confirmation (as the spiritual "seal" of the baptized), Holy Order (or the laying on of hands, with prayer for the appropriate "gift" of the Spirit, in the commissioning of men for the ministry), Penance (in the form of primitive Church discipline), and Unction (in the primitive form of the anointing of the sick with a view to their possible recovery), all have roots in the New Testament and in the practice (presumably) of the Church of New Testament times. The so-called "sacrament of Matrimony" stands by itself. Marriage as an institution is, from the point of view of the New Testament, an ordinance of God which is "as old as the Creation" (cf. Mark x. 6). It receives, no doubt, under the Gospel, a renewed consecration: but it is probable that the inclusion of matrimony among the "sacraments" was determined simply by the fact that the word *sacramentum* occurred in the Vulgate text of Eph. v. 32.



speaking not simply of symbolic, recognized, customary rites in and through which men have agreed together to seek after God. We are speaking of rites in and through which God, of His own free grace and initiative, wills to accomplish something for man. It is God who gives; it is man who receives. The traditional theology of sacraments is, in *this* sense, through and through evangelical.

Sacraments, therefore, are modes of the divine action within the Church. They have their being wholly within the sphere of the corporate life of the redeemed society, which is, as such, a life lived "in the spirit." According to the traditional theology, they are at once "signs" (*signa*) and "effectual signs" (*efficacia signa*): it can, indeed, be affirmed that they "effect that which they represent" (*efficiunt quod figurant*). Nevertheless, such a statement is true only if it be understood rightly: and, rightly interpreted, it means simply that God, who is Himself the supreme and sole ultimate fountain and "cause" of all grace, wills for His own good purposes to make use of the sacramental "signs" *instrumentaliter*, that is to say, as His instruments.

It may even be affirmed that the sacraments, by divine appointment, convey grace *ex opere operato*: but that phrase, once more, does *not* mean that the sacraments operate "magically." It means that the divine gift is real, that the divine grace is prevenient; that God is beforehand, anticipating all human faith; that the sacrament, in its very accomplishment, involves and implies already the eager outgoing of the divine gift of grace, freely offered to man. That the gift, thus graciously offered, cannot in fact be received without "faith" (*i.e.*, without a right disposition of soul), was by the schoolmen, who made use of the phrase *ex opere operato*, both presupposed and affirmed. Their concern, in using the phrase, was simply to safeguard the idea of the free objective reality of the divine grace actually offered to man. Of the scholastic doctrine of sacraments, considered as a whole, it must be said that, whatever may have been its defects, it was at least (to make use of a phrase which I take from F. Heiler) "eine grosse Predigt der *gratia sola*."

Sacramentalism, as it has existed historically within the Church, has not been *invariably* evangelical in spirit. The proportion of faith has not seldom been missed. There have been intrusions of legalism. There has been, at divers periods and in divers localities, a recurring tendency, on the part of the popular religious mind, to sink to a sub-Christian or (at least) to a sub-evangelical level, and to become frankly superstitious. The Christian religion is, nevertheless, in the words



of the late Baron von Hügel, "irreducibly *incarnational*": it is a religion of the Spirit, in the sense of being a religion *inspired* by the Spirit, but not in the sense of being unsacramental. There is, and there can be, a sacramentalism which lies close to the heart of the Gospel: and indeed, the Christianity of history has, *at its best*, been both in theory and practice in *this* sense sacramental. The Gospel, divorced from the sacraments, would be, in effect, something less and something other than the Christianity of the New Testament and of history.

## THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE SACRAMENTS

BY PROFESSOR D. W. STÄHLIN

1. LET us premise one point, about which full agreement exists: The sacrament is to be understood only in the light of the gospel and as an actualization of this gospel (cp. the paper of Dr. Rawlinson). But the gospel is the message of God's gift, and therefore the attitude of receiving, not of performing. That is the sense of the distinction so strongly emphasized by the Reformation between *beneficium* and *officium*. No discussion about this is necessary between us. But two remarks must be made, which refer to the relation of the sacrament to the gospel.

(a) Because the gospel is a joyful message, a message of salvation, the festal sound of *thankful joy* is suitable for the sacramental feast, and finds expression in the name *εὐχαριστία*. The equalization of the gospel with forgiveness of sins should not mean that the artificial creation of a sense of sin and penitential mood is the only justifiable way of approach to the sacrament. That must be said against the obscuration of the "Eucharist," as it has grown up from the over-emphasis of the doctrine of justification and confession of sin and from its regular connection with penance.

(b) The strict rejection of any thought of a sacramental performance may not be so understood that the *thought of sacrifice* which is essential for all worship is thereby called in question. The sacrifice, in the gospel sense, is of course never a performance or merit, but it is on the one hand that attitude of devotion to God without which there is no faith and no sacramental reception (I remind you of the line in Luther's hymn "to leave ourselves wholly to Thee"), on the other hand the "sacrifice of praise," of confession, adoration and active love.

2. The theology of the Reformation has indeed co-ordinated



the sacrament with the word, but it has predominantly subordinated it to the word; a clear doctrine about the special quality which belongs to the sacrament beside the word has not hitherto been developed. Above all, one must at any rate reject some unsatisfactory attempts to establish the distinction between word and sacrament.

(a) In no case may the *promissio* be assigned to the word, but the *efficacia* to the sacrament: for on the one hand the sacrament also contains an element of the *promissio*, viz. the assurance and "anticipation" of the final redemption; on the other hand a real *δύναμις* belongs also to the word, and it is not sufficiently characterized by the term *promissio*.

(b) It is equally impossible to say that the word appeals to faith, while the sacrament is active *ex opere operato*: for on the one hand it is true also of the word that it sets man *realiter* before God and thereby tends to his uplift or his fall; on the other hand in the sacrament it is not indeed the operation but the saving operation which is connected with faith. Luther's doctrine of the *manducatio impiorum* is not meant to secure a "magical" natural manner of operation, but just the distinguishing character of the sacrament (cp. 1 Cor. xi. 28 f.). Only a rationalistic evisceration of language, which no longer knows of the "magical" representation of fact in word, can at this point see a distinction between word and sacrament.

(c) Again, the word may not be understood as actual and dynamic, but the sacrament as a sacred object: for on the one hand it is also true of the sacrament that its sensible basis lies not in an object (element) but in an action, and that it is not a sacrament *extra usum* (the emphasis of the Reformation on *in actu* keeps also the actual dynamic character of the sacrament); on the other hand there belongs also to the word, especially the word of scripture, a definite *potentia* as a presupposition of its actual operation.

3. The sacrament is a *sensible bodily event*, above all as regards the form of reception. Of course, the word is also a sensible bodily event, and every attempt to degrade the word to a mere means of understanding makes the ecclesiastical, especially the liturgical, meaning of the word incomprehensible. The special quality also of the sacrament cannot be found in the visibility of the sign: for on the one hand the word also can come to us as visible sign, and on the other hand (let us say) a blind man is in no way cut off from full connection with this sign. Rather is this the special quality, that man in his sensible existence here is brought into a peculiar contact with certain elements, partly so that he enters into these elements, and partly that these elements enter into him.



(a) Herein lies, above all, the protest against every spiritualistic understanding of God's relation to man in general. In so far as what happens to man in the sacrament affects him corporally, one must urgently insist that it is the whole man in the unity of his psycho-physical being who stands before God and to whom comes God's gift of grace (I refer in full agreement to what Dr. Rawlinson said in his paper).

(b) The distinguishing point is, that something *happens* to man. The work which God does to man is not dependent on the processes or contents of man's consciousness. Luther defended this distinctive value of the sacrament, when he combated the opinion that the *significare* of the sacrament might come into being through an act of man's thought. Only because the event of the Divine visitation, independent of our conscious processes, finds expression in the sacrament can it obtain a meaning for man's certainty of salvation. The rite of infant baptism depends on this knowledge; and it is clear that this infant baptism is eviscerated by the idea that the sacrament of baptism must later, through man's own act of knowledge or confession, be "renewed," "strengthened," or "completed."

(c) Ignatius' expression adopted by Luther, that the sacrament is a *φάρμακον ἀθανασίας*, is an awkward expression for the certainty that the salvation promised to man concerns the whole man, and that this hope, including also the body, just finds its liturgical expression in the corporality of the sacramental event. So far the sacraments stand in close connection with the healing miracles of Jesus, who has indeed not only comforted or cleansed souls, but made bodies healthy.

4. But the sacraments are not only corporal, because something corporal happens to man, but they are at the same time natural in the sense that man comes in contact with certain *sensible-natural elements*. God's gift of salvation is bound in the sacrament to this connection with sensible elements of nature. This natural investment (cp. Luther's "He gave us His body to eat, hidden in bread so small") belongs also to the *verbum externum* over against every limitation of revelation to the inner light, it belongs to the "swaddling-bands," in which we ought to seek the Lord; we give God honour, according to Luther's opinion, just because we seek Him in the earthly form, in which He wishes to come to us.

(a) The connection between these elements of nature and God's gift of salvation may not be understood as if it were simply a question of a quality, which is attached to the nature as such, therefore a *natural endowment*, so that it would not need Christ at all. (Otto Fricke, in his work on the sacraments



[p. 31], thought that he could so describe the view of Paul Tillich, which was supposed also to be the view represented by the Berneuchen Conference. It is impossible here to go fully into the question, how far that is a complete misunderstanding. All "natural endowment" is ambiguous, and so it may be the presupposition, but not the essence of the sacramental meaning.)

(b) In the same way it is, of course, a "ritualistic" aberration to prove the sacramental meaning of these elements in a purely *historical* way with a supposed institution, which as regards baptism is not at all to be traced back to the historical Jesus, and as regards the Lord's Supper in its historical sense is not to be clearly defined. Luther's attempt to prove his "realistic" understanding of the sacrament in "nominalistic" terms was a theologically untenable expedient of his polemical interest.

(c) That the Church has used *certain* elements, and only those, in the sacraments, is not accidental and cannot be explained only by piety and tradition. We should rather say that certain elements of nature are "predisposed" to be a parable of the redemption through Christ (limitation to meet the objection of Pan-symbolism). On this parabolic character of certain elements of nature rest the "parables" of Jesus, which for this very reason are something else but arbitrary or accidental means of visualization. What is intended in these elements of nature is fulfilled in Christ (cp. *ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή*); just as one can only speak of prophecy in the light of fulfilment, and of an old covenant in the light of the new covenant, so we can only in this sense speak of parables in the light of the Kingdom of God. (That the sand of the desert or blood has occasionally been used in the Church for baptism, or on the other hand water has been used for the Lord's Supper, is to be understood either as an isolated substitute, or, as in the blood-baptism, as a real aberration.)

(d) It is important to notice that the symbolic character of the sacramental elements is connected with the *mortal destiny of nature*.

[(i.) Water represents the world in its unformed condition (Gen. i. 2); cp. the psycho-analytical discovery of water as symbol of the longing for death, as symbol of return to the mother's womb. Therefore the water in baptism can represent the earth as the grave, in which Christ was laid: *ex aqua nascimur; ex aqua renascimur*.

(ii.) Bread and wine are natural gifts, which are given to man for nourishment and refreshment. But this meaning of them is still at the same time bound to the mortal destiny of



nature, to the dying of the seed of corn, the breaking of bread, and the crushing of the grapes.]

(e) In the sacramental elements extra-human nature is comprised in the redemptive action of God. From the time of Christ and the Resurrection mortal destiny becomes the way of life, and the broken bread the food of eternal life. Thus understood, the sacraments are connected with the nature-miracles of Jesus (*e.g.*, stilling of the storm), in which Christ appears as Lord of the universe.

5. How far is the body of Christ present in the sacraments? Above all, it is to be remembered (in agreement with Sir E. Hoskyns) that the terms *σάρξ* and *σῶμα* do indeed overlap, but do not coincide, that therefore the presence of Christ's "flesh and blood" is not simply to be identified with the presence of the "body of Christ."

(a) Both the water and the bread and wine represent *Christ's flesh and blood*, in so far as they attest the power of the resurrection in the mortal elements. Besides, it is essential that not these elements of themselves in their objective being, but the peculiar actual relation of man to these elements (*actus et usus*), contain this relation to the sacrificial death of Christ, His "flesh and blood."

(b) The body of Christ is present in the *congregation*, into which man is incorporated through the sacrament, and which presents and renews itself in the sacramental meal. However early the presence of the body of Christ in the elements also was found through a confusion of these two thoughts, yet the other mode of thought, which designates the congregation but not the elements as the "body of Christ," maintains the interest of the oldest tradition (1 Cor. x. 11 also does not in any way compel us to take the view that St. Paul understood the sacramental food as the body of Christ; much rather 1 Cor. x. 16 *b* and xi. 22 *b.*, 29 point out clearly that the congregation is understood by the body of Christ, which is destroyed by the want of love).

So it is just the sacraments that make it clear that the *communio sanctorum* (cp. Paul Althaus' book of the same name) is a share-winning and a share-holding, and that the sacraments assure the individual man of his salvation, only because they give him a share in the sacrifice of Christ, they bring him into the secret of death and resurrection and incorporate him into the Church as the body of Christ.



## THE EUCHARIST IN RELATION TO THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE CHURCH

BY PROFESSOR C. H. DODD

1. THE primitive Eucharistic traditions of the Church come down to us embedded in an eschatological context. The Synoptic accounts of the Supper treat it as an anticipation of something to be "fulfilled in the Kingdom of God." Paul declares that the Sacrament shows forth the death of Christ "until He come." In the Liturgy of the Didache the closing prayers look towards the passing of "this world" and the coming of the Lord. The Messianic Banquet had already in pre-Christian thought served as a symbol of the Life of the Age to Come, and the sayings of the Lord sanctioned the symbol. The parable of the Great Feast, with its proclamation—"Come, for all things are now ready," is the counterpart of ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε. The symbolic act of feeding the multitude probably conveyed the same idea. The universal assumption of early Christian thought is that the Age to Come has now begun, and the farther back we go, the less sharply is the line drawn between the present experience of the Christian fellowship and the expected consummation. Thus to get the prayers of the Didache in their true perspective we must read them, not as referring to some far-off divine event, but as looking to the completion, and the speedy completion, of a state of affairs already initiated—indeed, already far advanced. The Lord who is called upon to "come" is "at the door." It is so even in the Apocalypse (xxii. 20, iii. 20; cf. Mark xiii. 29), which adds, "if any man will open the door, I will come in to him and will sup with him and he with me." Indeed, by His Resurrection and the coming of the Spirit He *has* come to His own, and He is "known to them in the breaking of bread," as the Emmaus story has it—a story in its main lines surely primitive.

Thus the "Breaking of Bread" appears as the ἀρραβών, as Paul would have said, of the Messianic Banquet, in which the people of God feast upon "spiritual food and drink." It is something more than a merely symbolic anticipation of the Life of the Coming Age; it is the present enjoyment in a mystery by faith of that which will shortly be fully revealed. Thus the Liturgy of the Didache gives thanks for "spiritual food and drink and the life of the (coming) age" already granted by God through His "Servant." It is but a step from this to the Johannine doctrine of the Bread of Life.

Hence the Church at the Table of the Lord is a sort of *enclave*



of the supernatural order within the order of "this world." Gathered with their glorified Lord the people of God "taste the powers of the world to come." As the hope of an imminent Parousia faded, the transmutation of eschatology implicit in the preaching of Jesus was carried through, and the Eucharist remained and remains the repository of all that was permanent and real in the eschatology of the early Church. The original eschatological character of the service is still attested in the various liturgies of the East and West. In it we come to the City of God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, and worship with angels and archangels and all the Company of heaven in the presence of the Lord.

2. That the Eucharist was celebrated "in remembrance" of Jesus is not, so far as our evidence goes, a part of the primitive tradition. But it is as early as Paul. The Apostle has been accused of leading the Church away from "the Jesus of History." It would be remarkable if it were really he who recalled the Church to a deliberate attention to the historical grounds of its faith, in the midst of its sacrament of the Age to Come. But, in fact, the remembrance of Jesus and of His death can never have been absent from the minds of the earliest companies of believers when they broke the bread as He had broken it. As the living witness of the first generation died out, this corporate memory of the facts became more important. In the life of the Church since then the Sacrament as a memorial of past facts of history has been a very remarkable example of the continuity of historical tradition. A community, like an individual, is a fact in four dimensions, and in the time-dimension the continuity of the Christian Church as a self-identical community is given, more than anywhere else, in the Eucharist. And that continuity starts in the living memory of those who knew the Founder of our religion as He was in Galilee and Jerusalem. Before a page of our earliest Gospel sources had been written the remembrance of the Lord had passed through channels of personal intercourse to Christian communities "from Jerusalem round to Illyricum" and beyond. And from that day to our own there has been no break in the continuity of the Church's memory of the life and death of its Lord. When we cite His words "This is My Body," and do *quod ipse auctor fecit*, we, the Church, remember His speaking and acting thus. "That which we have seen and heard, that which our hands have handled, we declare" in this Sacrament. Thus the *Heilstatsachen* are always contemporary facts to the consciousness of the Church.

3. Besides its specific character as an eschatological sacrament and a memorial of the Lord, the Eucharist has the general



character of a rite of Communion. As such it finds analogues or parallels in many other religions. Eating and drinking together is a natural and primitive means of fellowship, for in so far as *homo est quod est* identity of food means identity of substance. "We who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf."\* Further, in the act of eating we realize and acknowledge our dependence upon that which is not ourselves—a dependence so absolute that if we attempt to deny it we cease to exist. Primitive man deified the corn-spirit, and in feeding upon corn felt himself to be absorbing the mysterious power of life that manifested itself in early growth, death, and resurrection. But man, so soon as he is ever so little removed from the animals, is dimly aware that the life that is in him is more than physical. There is no sharp dividing-line between the physical and the psychical, between the psychical and the spiritual. When we speak of human life we mean all these in indivisible unity. It is no recent discovery that man doth not live by bread alone. And as he is dependent for the life of the body upon that which is not himself, but higher, stronger, more permanent than himself, so he is dependent for the life of the Soul and of the Spirit upon that which is not himself. By every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God shall man live.

Thus a rite of communion testifies to our fellowship in creaturely dependence upon the Source of Life. The Eternal God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, communicates His own life to us, and the life is shared among us, making us one in Him. It is the *differentia* of the Christian rite of communion that it associates this communication of Divine life with the historical sacrifice of Christ for us. "The bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world." Thus it expresses not merely a general dependence upon God as Lord and Giver of Life, but dependence upon that which God did in Christ, within history, for us men and for our salvation. The historical and the mystical elements in our religion are perfectly fused in the Sacrament. It holds already implicit within it the Christology of the Church, for if in showing forth the death of Christ we thank God for the gift of eternal life, if our "communion of the Body of Christ" is the form in which we partake of the life of God given to us, then we must needs believe that Christ who gave Himself for us is "of one substance" with the Eternal God.

\* It may be observed that some of the Reformed Churches have tried to emphasize this aspect of the Sacrament by a ritual in which, after the Bread and Wine have been consecrated, they are passed from hand to hand among the laity, who thus communicate one another—*λάβετε τούτο καὶ διαμερίσate eis ἑαυτοὺς*, Lk. xxii. 17.



4. Thus the Church as the unity of believers is most truly itself in the Sacrament of communion, in which its individual members are nourished with the life of God in Christ which is His common gift to them all. In a particular local congregation the sharing of one Loaf and one Cup establishes the unity of that congregation. That is all it would do, but that the Loaf and the Cup are the means of communion with God in Christ; and as there is one God and Father of all, and one Lord Jesus Christ who once died for us all, whereon the Bread is broken, there is His one body, there is the Catholic Church. Similarly, the single congregation, entering into the Church's corporate memory of its Lord, shares the experience of the whole Body as a living community, continuous and identical in time as well as in space. And as that experience is of the eschatological order, discovering the end in every stage of the process, the congregation knows itself to be in the presence of the whole Church triumphant, and so is lifted above all particularity of space and time. Thus the Sacrament is a witness that the Catholic Church is no aggregate of parts, but lives as a whole in every congregation of Christian people which breaks the bread and pours out the wine with the sincere intention of showing forth the Lord's death until He come and making a communion of His Body and Blood. The Eucharist, rather than the episcopate, is the true *sacramentum unitatis*.

---

## CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND THE BODY OF CHRIST

BY DR. E. G. SELWYN

### I

THE standpoint from which we shall best approach this subject is that of the "holy people"—a conception common to Old and New Testament alike. In the Old Testament the holy people is the people of the holy God. In its earliest signification holiness means separation (*cf.* Num. vi., especially verse 8, "All the days of his separation he [*i.e.*, the Nazarite] is holy unto the Lord"); that is to say, there is a distinctiveness or eminence in Yahweh as compared with other gods, and therefore in Yahweh's people as compared with other peoples. The idea was not at first primarily ethical, but was moralized under the influence of the prophets, who taught that Yahweh was righteous Himself and required righteousness in His people (*cf.* Micah vi.



10). This righteousness was embodied in a Law which was at once moral and ceremonial, the two elements being inextricably interfused (*e.g.*, it is from the ceremonial book Leviticus [xix. 18] that our Lord draws the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"). The moral law embodied in the Pentateuch is of a wide range, including sexual relations, respect for human life, the treatment of strangers, economic questions (*cf.* the directions as to the jubilee year, Lev. xxv. 8 *ff.*), blasphemy.

Post-exilic Judaism tightened up the disciplinary hold of the Law on the Jewish people: the nation became a Church. Not to know the Law was now to be "accursed"; and those who offend against the Law or the authorities who interpret and enforce it are liable to be excommunicated (*ἄποσυνάγωγοι*).

## II

Jews interpreted His function as Messiah as consisting in "fulfilling all righteousness"—*i.e.*, in the rendering of a complete obedience, on His own behalf and on others', to God. His attitude to the Law might be expressed in the phrase, "The Lord looketh on the heart" (1 Sam. xvi. 7): He looked beyond conduct to the motive and spirit which inspired it—*cf.* the Sermon on the Mount. His treatment of earlier ethical tradition may be illustrated in three directions. In regard to economic issues, Jesus laid all the emphasis on the danger of riches, which might easily be an *obex* to membership in the Messianic kingdom. In regard to marriage, He went behind the Mosaic ordinances to base monogamy on the primal facts of creation. In His treatment of the Sabbath He at once endorses the institutional side of religion and gives it a new motive and spirit. Generally speaking, it may be said that the distinctive mark of the Messianic righteousness proclaimed by Jesus is its reference of all thought and action to God; and it is this which accounts for His emphasis on the forgiveness of sins.

## III

The origin of the Christian Church consists in the formation out of the old Israel, which rejected Jesus, of the new Israel or Israel of God, consisting of those who recognized His divine authority and came to understand that He was the Messiah. To this Messianic community and to its officers (the Twelve) the Lord gave the disciplinary authority which had previously belonged to the Jewish Church and its leaders (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 15-18). Two qualities stand out as especially characteristic of the new righteousness of the Israel of God—*viz.*, humility



(which derives from the old Hebrew conception of the creatureliness of man) and love. St. John xiii., which serves as a prologue to the story of the Passion, is also a kind of epitome of the new ethic. It is based on a "washing" by the divine Son; it draws out the lesson of His humility in washing His disciples' feet; and it is consummated in the bond of charity knitting them together.

The opening chapters of Acts reveal these principles in action. St. Peter's preaching produces contrition, followed by baptism and the remission of sins. The humility and love of the Christians shows itself in the giving of their goods to the common fund of the Church; in Acts vi. and xv. we see the Apostolic authority in full exercise—in the latter case on an issue that was primarily ethical.

#### IV

The same thing holds good of St. Paul's teaching and practice. The basis of the Christian moral life lies in the justifying faith which corresponds to God's grace in baptism (Rom. vi.). The believer is thus made a member of the *Corpus Christi*; and it is this status to which the Apostle commonly appeals as the reason and motive of the conduct expected of Christians. Thus he bases his appeal for humility on the difference of function pertaining to the several organs of the body (1 Cor. xiii.). Purity is demanded of Christians because they are members of Christ and their bodies temples of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. vi. 15, 19; iii. 16). It is a consequence, likewise, of "any fellowship of the spirit" that every man should look not "on his own things, but . . . also on the things of others" (Phil. ii. 1-4). The Christian's charity and humility flow side by side from the example of the incarnate Son (*ib.* 5 ff.). And so distinctive is the quality of Christian love that it needs what is virtually a new coinage in the language of ethics, ἀγάπη, in order to describe it.\*

St. Paul often appears in his Epistles as exercising the disciplinary authority which belonged to the Apostolate in the Church. So he deals firmly with the case of incest at Corinth (1 Cor. v.); he lays down rules with regard to various questions of marriage (1 Cor. vii.); and he gives detailed counsel (as also does 1 Peter) with regard to the relationship of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and slaves. It is significant that his treatment of these subjects is governed by the dominating idea of the "edifying" or building up of the Church (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 3, 4; Eph. iv. 12; v. 22 ff.).

\* It was rightly pointed out in the discussion that the word derives from the LXX use of the verb ἀγαπᾶν to denote love for God and for neighbour.



## V

When we turn to later New Testament writers, two developments are particularly to be observed. (1) Emphasis is laid on the gravity of those sins which involve *apostasy*—i.e., a wilful rejection of the Church and its standards in favour of the life and standards of the world. Three sins, in particular, are reckoned to be common signs of such apostasy—viz., fornication or adultery, idolatry, and murder. But they are not the only three. There is also the sin represented in the character of Esau, who “found no place of repentance.” He is described as a “profane person”—i.e., a man without spiritual sensibilities, a secularist—who, when he had to choose between his birthright and the impulses and desires of the moment, chose the latter. And of this sin of apostasy the Epistle to the Hebrews and 1 John (v. 16) say, as Jesus had said of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, that it admitted of no forgiveness. Such a sinner cannot be restored, or even (St. John says) be prayed for: his sin is “unto death.”

(2) 1 John contains teaching in regard to the sins of Christians which seems at first sight to be inconsistent. On the one hand, he says that “whosoever is born of God sinneth not”: on the other that the only remedy for sin is confession of it (1 John i. 8-10). In the former case, it would appear that he is speaking of the immunity from sin, which (however rare in fact) Christians ought to regard as their usual condition: in the latter, he is speaking of those sins of infirmity which do in fact beset the lives of the faithful.

## CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND THE BODY OF CHRIST

BY OSCAR BAUHOFFER

1. WE are incorporated into the body of Christ through the act of Baptism which is performed upon us. Baptism is the “fundamental” act through which the fact of being a Christian and a member in the body of Christ is constituted. Baptism is at the same time also the fundamental act through which the life of him who is a member in the body of Christ is raised to “Christian” life in the specific sense: to life which is holy, because it shares in the life of *Corpus Christi mysticum*. The being of him who is incorporated into the *Corpus Christi* is



his membership, just as the being of the natural man is identical with his membership in the Adamic humanity. We have passed from the sphere of being of the Adamic man into the fellowship of being in the body of Christ. Through Baptism we stand in the sign of the Cross of Christ, in the sign of grace. Baptism means that our life is henceforth ordered. Baptism is therefore not merely the fundamental, but the decisive act over our whole life (an *opus operatum*). The existential situation of him who has received Baptism consists in this, that he can either assent to this decision taken over his life or oppose it. The life of him who is a member of the body of Christ is anyhow already ordered; he can only install himself in the reality of this decision in the obedience of faith or withdraw himself from it in an act of "disloyalty" and disobedience. In face of God's decision there is also no longer the right of doubt and "free testing" in the name of free personality: we are no longer "free," we are bound, we are existentially ordered by God, whom we know as revealed, just as we have been known before by Him.

It follows from this that Christian ethics do not consist primarily in an *ideal*, which it is our business to strive after with ceaseless effort. The life of the Christian issues quite really from the fulness of a gracious reality, which lies open to him from the beginning of his membership in the Corpus Christi, and which is ever integrated anew in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And just because the Christian life does not begin with "longing" but with "fulfilment," it is as far as possible from all Perfectionism. (Here, as can only be said by way of observation, the thought of the "saints" is also theologically very full of meaning.) The life of the Christian is, in the last resort, a serious life, because "Christian life" is the existential loyalty towards God's call, who has decided about our life. The Christian life is obedience, but not of slavish and also not (at least not primarily) of heroic kind, but an obedience from vocation and so from the fulness—in a word, the obedience of childhood. That means, therefore, that the Christian life is not primarily an imperative but an indicative. The status of childhood, which is synonymous with the status of obedience, can only be either kept or lost, and the existential fundamental formula of the Christian life is, therefore: keep or lose.

2. With the foregoing observations we have already implicitly taken up a position towards the conception occasionally held in the new Protestant theology, that there is not a system of theological ethics. According to this thesis, the task of theology in the philosophical problem of ethics consists in this,



to place the phenomenon of Christian life in the general scheme of human morality and to show that the Christian way is the crowning conclusion which is demanded by human thoughts of morality. This conception, at any rate, is only tenable when the essentially new, which is revealed with the membership in the body of Christ, is misunderstood or disputed. This thesis is proved, so far as it is regarded as a theological judgment, as developed out of a fundamental misunderstanding of theological things. The specific being of the body of Christ demonstrates the theological *a priori*, from which also Christian and "theological" ethics acquire their indisputable right. Yet a correct and theologically very significant intuition underlies this thesis, which, of course, must first be freed from its non-theological premisses and be quite freshly formulated. It is a question of the problem of the relation of nature and grace. Christian ethics—like Christian being—is the "completion" of the natural in the supernatural. The order of grace is not, as that thesis wishes to have it, the member that rounds off the whole within the order of nature. But the kingdom of the natural and fallen creature and the kingdom of grace stand in a relation of real superiority and subordination. Christian thought has placed in the foreground now one, now the other, of the two aspects of the fallen creature: the intensity of its dependence on grace, or the depth of its fallen state and need of redemption. So long as both are known as the two sides of one and the same phenomenon, the Christian fundamental knowledge of the relation between nature and grace is maintained. In the light of this knowledge the question of the relation between Christian and extra-Christian ethics is to be discussed. One must explain the gravity of this question by a concrete example. If the point at issue is nothing else than (let us say) to comprehend Buddhism as the radical negation of all Christian fundamental values, and if the scheme of the interdependence of the natural and supernatural orders seems likely to break up, it can only be explained according to my conviction in this way, that Buddhism and cognate manifestations of the Indian spirit themselves exhibit a complete perversion of "natural" values and standards.\*

3. The relation of Christian ethics to the "non-Christian world"—i.e., to secular ethics and secular modes of life—is today of quite special urgency and presents a theological problem of the greatest magnitude. The problem is complicated, but also made absolutely unavoidable, because the secular orders almost completely dominate our personal as well as our social

\* Cp. my discussion of Scheler's Metaphysics of Value in *The Meta-Religious: A Critical Philosophy of Religion*. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1930, p. 119 ff.



life, and these secular orders do not any longer profess or claim to be Christian. Everything that in any way is to be comprehended under the term "modern civilization," in the broadest sense, belongs to the non-Christian world, to secular ethics. As against this condition of things the apocalyptic demand of a complete separation becomes a pious self-deception and practically a capitulation to secular ethics; and the progressive optimism of the social gospel (and of the theological equivalent ethics of the older German liberal theology) becomes impious self-deception and practically as much as the renunciation of a "Christian" attitude. Both the realities of the Christian and the secular exist simply side by side. Secular events—in State and political economy and national life—have their own laws and also their own problems and complications. But these laws of secular events are in the last resort nothing else than the orders of *natural law* and their complications and distortions and confusions, or this order of natural law which is rooted in the order of creation. These orders of natural law and life touch man most immediately, who is the dividing point of the natural and the supernatural order of grace. And from man, who, by his destiny, is placed in the secular events, follows compulsorily the "Christian" standpoint, and, we may add by way of explanation, the *theological* interest of the Church in the formation of secular events, of which it teaches the natural demonstration and connection (in which the "autonomy" finds its limit). "In making natural law the basis and starting-point of her social philosophy the Church bears witness to her solidarity with mankind and the primary order of things as created by God"—and thus affirms once more the basic unity of Creation, with its ascending scale of nature, and grace.\*

\* May I call the attention of readers to a pamphlet entitled "The Churches and Present-Day Economic Problems" (published by the International Christian Social Institute, Geneva, and to be obtained from the Industrial Christian Fellowship, 4, The Sanctuary, Westminster, S.W. 1. at 6d. per copy)? It contains a very careful report of findings of the London Conference of Christian Social Workers held last July under the joint auspices of the Christian Social Council and the Geneva Social Institute and the principal papers. The above quotation is from the author's paper presented to that body on the Problem of a Christian Sociology and printed in the pamphlet referred to.



## GENERAL NOTES ON THE DISCUSSION

It was generally agreed and emphasized that the Church forms both the starting-point and the goal of the whole Christian conception of religious fellowship, considered as "*Corpus Christi*." Consequently, a discussion of what is involved in Christian fellowship is possible only upon the basis of an understanding of the nature of the Church. The following points emerged during the week as of supreme significance, and the discussion tended to revolve round them and to return again and again to them.

## I

## THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE OF GOD

The nature of the Church can be understood only on the ground of the significance of the *Qahal* in the O.T., since as *Corpus Christi* the Church is the fulfilment of the O.T. *Qahal*. It was objected that in the teaching of Jesus religious fellowship is broadened out beyond the *Qahal*, as for example in the picture of the women (Luke viii. 1-3) and in the assigning to the religious community of all who do the will of God (Mark iii. 35 and parallels). It was then pointed out that it is precisely these passages which are controlled by the thought of the *Qahal*, since the intimate disciples of Jesus are its true representatives. The words "do the will of God" cannot be interpreted without reference to the primitive Christian, and especially to the Pauline, conception of the Church and of Justification. As the Founder of the N.T. ἐκκλησία, Jesus does the will of God; and as the representative of the People of God, He shows forth the Church in His own Person. The "I am" sayings in the Fourth Gospel are to be understood in the light of this concentration. But the Church and the Kingdom of God are not identical. The Church is, rather, the instrument of the Kingdom; and it can exist only as *ecclesia militans*, *ecclesia pressa*, not as *ecclesia triumphans*, which is the Kingdom of God, when God will be all in all (1 Cor. xv). The Church, which is *corpus mixtum*, since it stands under the power of sin, will then cease to be. The future Kingdom of God is present now only in the Person of Jesus Christ (cf. G. Kittel's formulation of the αὐτοβασιλεία at the Canterbury Conference, 1927).



## II

## THE CHURCH AND SOCIOLOGY

Whether the Church be national, established, or regional, or whether it be where two or three be gathered together in His name, it has in every case a sociological significance. Yet its veritable and necessary significance becomes apparent only when the Church itself is rightly understood. This right understanding depends upon the recognition of the Church as the Body of Christ. It is misunderstood when it is thought of merely as an illustration, familiar to the sociologists and to students of comparative religion, of the creation of a corporate fellowship under the influence of religion. The State, which is itself a sociological entity, and which by definition is secular and not Christian, can regard the Church only as an association possessing social and legal rights. It cannot perceive the church as The Church—a *genus per se*. For this very reason a concordat between Church and State is necessary. Sociologists, and especially those concerned with the sociology of religion, ought to avoid the use of the word "church," which is to them unintelligible.

All these points, of course, provoked a lively discussion.

## III

## THE CHURCH AND ETHICS

The relation between the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans and the Sermon on the Mount requires careful consideration. The ultimate problem concerns the extent to which ethics constitute the essence of the Church. The exact relation between Justification and Sanctification is not a matter of accepted and agreed Christian doctrine. In the famous 7th article of the *Confessio Augustana* it is stated that the Church is constituted by the "Proclamation of the Gospel" and by the "Dispensing of the Sacraments." In the Articles of the Church of England the "Word of God" is substituted for the "Gospel."

The Anglican members of the conference were, on the whole, dissatisfied with the Lutheran insistence that Justification, in the sense of forgiveness of sin, constitutes the essence of the Church; and they maintained that Redemption involves more than Justification, that forgiveness of sin does not exhaust the meaning of the *καινή κτίσις*, and that the glory of God in the Body of Christ has a richer significance. Since, however, for the Lutherans forgiveness of sin means the Word of Divine



Grace, they pointed out that they did not intend to exclude Sanctification (St. Paul, indeed, speaks of the fruits of the Spirit); they did, however, wish to make clear that Sanctification must not be understood to mean Perfectionism. In the New Testament Christian ethics are always a problem. This is illustrated by the manner in which St. Paul addresses the "saints" with moral imperatives. The "saints" are not what they are.

## IV

## THE CHURCH AND MYSTICISM

The phrase *ἐν χριστῷ*, if it be mystical, is certainly also historical—that is, it draws attention to the Crucifixion. Christ-mysticism is to be sharply distinguished from Hellenistic mysticism, and indeed from all other mysticism, because it is wholly controlled by an historical event which took place in flesh and blood in Palestine. Jesus was crucified upon a cross by the Jews who had rejected Him as the Christ. The historical "first of all" (*ἐν πρώτοις*, 1 Cor. xv. 3) is meaningless to the true mystic, or at least he transfers the emphasis. Compare the classic words of Angelus Silesius:

If Christ be born in Bethlehem a thousand times,  
And be not born in thee,  
Thou dost remain for ever lost.

There is, then, in the Church, no fellowship with the risen Christ apart from the founding of the Church; and the Church has its origin in the historical action of Jesus Christ. Thus St. Paul uses the perfect *ἐσταυρωμένος*, not the aorist *σταυρωθείς*; and thereby distinguishes carefully between a mere historical event and an event in the past which carries with it present significance. Consequently, the primitive Christian conception of the Church is not spiritual, mystical, pneumatic, but historical. This has always been misunderstood, and is still misunderstood, by the "enthusiasts," who relate themselves with the Paraclete. This is, however, not the Paraclete of the New Testament.

What is characteristic of the Resurrection is not that the life of Jesus was, as it were, prolonged, but that His historical life, and especially all that the Crucifixion meant, was ratified by God. The Resurrection is the "yes" of God to the Cross. In this context the conversion of St. Paul must be understood (*i.e.*, in the sphere of the Resurrection); in spite of all difficulties, he belongs, and must be related, to the Apostles of the primitive Church. Here, again, it will be readily seen that there was much room for discussion.



## V

## THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS

The discussion turned largely on the significance of the sacramental "elements." The Lutherans were here divided. They were, however, united in asserting that there must be no separation of Word and Sacrament (*non nisi in actu*). They insisted that the Word must be *Verbum Externum*, though they seemed awkwardly conscious that in this emphasis there may have been originally a certain concession to humanism, which must now be avoided.

The Anglican members were, of course, throughout this discussion influenced by the controversies concerning the Revised Prayer Book. A somewhat lengthy discussion took place upon the meaning of the words *σῶμα* and *σάρξ*. In another context some of the Anglicans suggested that if the word "repetition" was to be used, the Eucharist was the repetition of the Last Meal in the Upper Room and not a repetition of the Sacrifice on Calvary. The conference was also reminded that, when all was said, sacrificial language constituted something of an embarrassment in the New Testament, and that this embarrassment had fundamental theological significance.

\* \* \* \* \*

On the last evening the question of Apostolical Succession was discussed between the Lutheran and Anglican members of the conference. The conversation centred round a statement that the Apostolical Succession is not a problem of organization, but a problem of the Gospel.

It will be readily understood that during the conference many exegetical points came up for discussion, which elude description in a brief report.

Finally, it was decided that the conference should meet again in Germany in the spring of 1933, and that the subject should be "The Holy Spirit."



## REVIEWS

**THE HISTORIC JESUS.** By James Mackinnon, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh. Longmans. 16s.

The study of the New Testament has in the past derived much benefit from the incursions of scholars from other fields of study. To mention such names as Wellhausen and Norden is to mention the origin of great schools of criticism. It is, therefore, with some measure of excitement that we welcome the onslaught of such an eminent historian as Dr. Mackinnon upon the problem of the Jesus of history.

Indeed, Dr. Mackinnon's onslaught is directly provoked by dissatisfaction with the present phase of New Testament criticism. The "tendency to eliminate extensively from the Gospels what are deemed later importations into the tradition has been overdone." The *formgeschichtliche* method has "been carried too far." What is needed is "a critical study of the historic Jesus, in accordance with scientific historic method."

Literary criticism, however, must not be entirely rejected. The recognition of the priority of Mark and of a "didactic source, Q," is a definite accomplishment. But, if we are to gain "a fairly adequate and substantially real *aperçu* of the historic Jesus," we must avoid "subjective presuppositions, too facile reasonings, and fanciful conclusions," must take greater account of psychology, and must exercise more largely "an historic imagination," and an "elasticity of judgement, in accordance with such considerations."

With such weapons Dr. Mackinnon sets out to challenge New Testament criticism. He begins by making an extensive survey of the Life of Jesus. For this purpose he adopts, with a large measure of confidence, the Marcan Hypothesis, and supplements it, slightly less confidently, with the Lucan account of the Journey to Jerusalem, and even, at times, with details gleaned from the Fourth Gospel. At times literary criticism is used to support his conclusions, but in curious fashion. Q, for instance, is twice cited, *not in order to corroborate, but in order to supplement*, Mark. Matthew is used to support Mark, not only where there is evidence of a special source, *but also where the Marcan source has been used*. Nevertheless, the reconstruction of the history is not entirely arbitrary. It is based on the judgement that Mark is good history as long as he concurs with modern humanistic ideas. Hence this sort of deduction can



be made: The Lucan position of those Sayings also found in the Sermon on the Mount and in the Great Charge to the Twelve in Matthew is to be preferred, because there runs through the chapters of Luke in which they are set "a note of coming Tragedy." It is therefore possible to say quite categorically: "The passage in the Matthæan charge to the Twelve about taking up the Cross and losing one's life in order to find it clearly belongs to the later stage of Jesus' ministry." There is no question, apparently, as to whether mention of the Cross can be regarded as belonging to the Ministry at all. Is it, perhaps, "fanciful and facile" to suggest that the only reason for regarding these Sayings as Logia is that the "note of Tragedy," (by which is meant the *δεῖ παθεῖν* passages) inextricably permeates the whole material of the Tradition? Yet if we do not question them, and if we cling to the Markan Hypothesis, how do we reconcile with our theory of a growing consciousness of tragedy such an "early" Saying as: "But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days" (Mark ii. 21)?

Such treatment of the material would be innocuous were it not, in the second half of the book, made the basis of an estimation of the Christology. The unquestioning adoption of the Lucan story of the preaching at Nazareth contributes to the same belief in a growing Messianic consciousness. The Temptation narrative is sufficient evidence for suspecting the attachment of Messianic significance to supernatural works. The Baptism narrative conveys

"the fact of a special spiritual enlightenment by the Holy Spirit. To Jesus himself it came in the form of the conviction that he was chosen, destined to fill the vocation of the Messiah, in accordance with certain passages of Scripture on which he had evidently been long meditating. This conviction is, I think, the culmination of a long process of searching for the meaning of his life, his destiny, such as many have felt since then—for the loadstar by which to shape his course through time into eternity."

This "elasticity of judgement," which involves the constant employment of such arguments as "I think," "to my mind," "what seems to have happened," "in my opinion," "it does strike one," allows Dr. Mackinnon to question the authenticity of a raising from the dead on the ground of the similarity of Luke vii. 15 to 1 Kings xvii. 23, and to use Luke ii. 52 to emphasize the real humanity of Jesus in the Third Gospel without noting its similarity to 1 Sam. ii. 26. Nay, more. It is apparently possible to reconstruct from stories which must be rejected on the grounds of impossibility *what really happened*; for instance:



"Jesus did effect the cure of the maniac, but only after a prolonged convulsion which frightens the swine and causes them to rush helter-skelter over the precipice into the lake."

An examination of our Lord's consciousness of pre-existence ignores the implications of the Synoptic "Son of Man—Son of God" Christology. Yet the sense of intrusion from another plane into humiliation which attaches to this Christology might be thought to have some bearing on the subject. The Kingdom, without any sufficient examination of its use in the Logia, is distinguished as "ethico-spiritual" in the present, and "eschatological" in the future. Was there no eschatology involved in the Coming of Jesus in the flesh? In short, Dr. Mackinnon makes no attempt to evaluate the history as it was enacted in terms of the mind of Jesus who enacted it, but tries instead to force into the mould of modern humanitarianism the records of an event that happened in Palestine nearly two thousand years ago. But to the historian, the problem consists in the fact of certain beliefs, which he knows to have existed in the minds of the Evangelists, of the Church from which the New Testament emanated. From this fact he must start, and not from the assumption of a Personality, which is no fact at all but a theory. And his method must similarly be based at all points on facts, whether they be educed to assign certain parts of the Tradition to the needs of the Church, or whether they be educed to guarantee authenticity. In neither case would his bare judgement, however much it might have been developed in the study of hagiography, carry any weight with students of the New Testament. And therefore, unless a challenge to present-day New Testament criticism be backed up at all points with a proper consideration of the facts presented by the documents, the New Testament critic may, perhaps with justice, be inclined to think that he has more to teach the lay historian than to learn from him.

NOEL DAVEY.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO SAINT LUKE. By H. Balmforth, M.A. The Clarendon Bible. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 4s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE. By William Manson, D.D. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. By John Martin Creed, D.D. Macmillan and Co. 15s.

The writings of St. Luke present a major historical and theological problem. The broad catholic philanthropy of the



special material in the Third Gospel, the solid unity of the Primitive Church in Acts, the omission of the Marcan-Matthæan Logion, *The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many*, and the shorter version of the words spoken in the Upper Room, indicate a theological perspective which differs subtly from that which underlies the Pauline Epistles, the Gospel of Mark, the special material of Matthew, and even the strata of evangelical tradition known as Q. How is this difference to be explained? This is the problem of the Lucan writings.

Since the publication in 1896 of Alfred Plummer's great work upon the gospel, which was professedly a commentary upon the text as it stands rather than a contribution to the reconstruction of the history of the Primitive Church, there has been produced in England no considerable commentary on St. Luke's Gospel, though we have had a number of essays upon particular points of interest. But we are not herein worse off than are other countries, since no competent scholar is entirely happy in his treatment of St. Luke; or, at least, no work on the Lucan writings succeeds in avoiding very severe criticism. And now the year 1930 has given us three commentaries upon the gospel.

In estimating the value of a work upon one of the four gospels, it is important to be quite clear what may reasonably be expected of a commentary. The author may intend to introduce his readers to an intelligent appreciation of the book, without presuming of them any technical knowledge; he may assume a technical knowledge, and set out to break new critical ground; he may write primarily as a theologian, and endeavour to use the critical prolegomena in order to delineate the faith of the Primitive Church and address himself to the problem of its nature and of its origin; or he may be concerned to use the critical method in order to encourage and guide the faith of his readers. The three commentaries fall under three of these four types, and are addressed to three fairly distinct groups of readers.

Mr. Balmforth has written the almost perfect commentary for those who are beginning a serious study of the gospels. His book can be read by those ignorant of Greek, and will be useful also to many who are more or less familiar with the Greek language. His introduction is a masterpiece of clarity and of judgment. He knows much more than he has set down; and this scholarly reserve is not only of great value for the beginner, but gives the general reader confidence in the author. The commentary itself is made up of carefully written prefaces to the sections of the gospel, of detached notes, and of a running



commentary in small type. Mr. Balmforth has achieved what he set out to do. "The reader's first critical duty," he writes, "is to appreciate the noble beauty of this great work of art and religion." Without doubt he has helped the reader to this appreciation.

On certain occasions Mr. Balmforth has taken a definite side in a critical controversy when he might, with advantage, have left the issue far more uncertain. The relation between St. Luke and St. Paul remains a puzzle in spite of what he says on pp. 25 and 26; the dating of Mark on p. 27, even with the word "probably," is a venturesome hazard. More serious is the general acceptance of Canon Streeter's Proto-Luke hypothesis (pp. 10-14), and the consequent loss of an important testing of St. Luke's editorial possibilities. It is difficult, moreover, to understand what justification there is for writing that, in the narrative of the Rejection at Nazareth, "St. Luke follows Q in preference to Mark," or, even with the authority of Canon Streeter, for regarding as an "attractive hypothesis" his "tentative suggestion" that the omission of Mark vi. 45 to viii. 26 was occasioned by St. Luke's use of a mutilated copy of Mark. In the perspective of the whole commentary these are, however, details; and it must be remembered that Mr. Balmforth's book was written and published before it was possible for him to consult Professor Creed's commentary.

Dr. Manson's commentary can also be read and understood without a knowledge of Greek. It is the fifth of the new series of commentaries based upon Dr. Moffatt's translation of the New Testament, and its purpose is stated by Dr. Moffatt himself in his general preface. "The aim of this commentary is to bring out the religious meaning and message of the New Testament writings." The author explains in his own preface that the general design of the series involves critical and historical treatment.

The commentary revolves round two critical convictions. The first conviction is not only that the peculiar wealth of the Third Gospel is due to the presence in it of the special Lucan matter, but that the source of Special Luke was Judean. "Visiting Palestine in the company of Paul between the years A.D. 57 and 59, the Gentile evangelist fell under the spell of the Mother Church of Jerusalem and of the special tradition which he found there, and to the inspiration of this experience we may trace the genesis of his idea of writing a gospel." Consequently, the universally human aspects of Christ and the spontaneity of feeling which are "at their maximum" in Special Luke, have for Dr. Manson the authority of the Mother Church in Jerusalem: "paradoxical as it seems, the Gentile writer Luke in some



respects reflects the spirit of Judaic Christianity more fully than any of his peers." And yet in his introduction, though not so much in his commentary, Dr. Manson holds this judgment severely in check. The leaning of Luke was, he says, "towards the emotional and practical aspects of religion, towards the elements of feeling and action," and "theological interests were not paramount" in his mind. These characteristics he judges to be due to an adapting of the Gospel to the larger needs of humanity, and Luke "hardly brings out to the full the intellectual as well as spiritual reaction to Judaism in which the religion of the Master was grounded"; and moreover, "if Luke was truly a companion of Paul, he shows but little distinctive appreciation of the profounder ideas of that apostle." These are very wise and very mature words.

The second conviction which cuts deep into the commentary is the critical conviction that Jesus offered "his nation not a new doctrine of the kingdom of God, but a new conception of God's will which, if received, will bring the goal indicated by the kingdom of God into measurable, indeed, into immediate, relation with the lives of men" (p. 89, cf. p. viii). Here is the point where the author makes his contribution to the religion of today, and where his commentary fits into Dr. Moffatt's general design. The main emphasis in the commentary is consequently laid upon the teaching of Jesus. "On close approach we find that loving enemies, meeting evil with good, dying to self, and becoming by a new birth sons of God, constitute the central and vital datum, the 'mystery,' which Jesus reveals to men."

Taken as a whole, the commentary has been written by a man accustomed to think carefully before he writes. It is a more difficult commentary than Mr. Balmforth's, because Dr. Manson's purpose is different. It is not easy to extract from the gospels their religious significance for today, and at the same time to remain severely critical. The book will be found valuable by those who have already some knowledge of modern work upon the New Testament.

With Professor Creed's commentary we are in a wholly different atmosphere. It is a book for specialists; and is, in some ways, similar to Dr. Klostermann's commentary in the *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, upon which, indeed, it to some extent depends. The importance of Professor Creed's work is to be found in his valuable sketch of the history of the interpretation of the gospel, and more particularly in his criticism of Canon Streeter's Proto-Luke hypothesis. It is indeed this criticism which gives the commentary its peculiar significance. Both Mr. Balmforth's and Dr. Manson's work would prob-



ably have been influenced had they had the opportunity of consulting it.

Professor Creed categorically denies Canon Streeter's theory that Mark is interpolated into an already existing Lucan framework of Q and L material. "Mark," he writes, "must be regarded as a determining factor in the construction of the existing book from the outset." Consequently, Lucan editing of Mark is reinstated again as of dominant importance for the interpretation of the Third Gospel. Throughout the commentary Professor Creed is concerned to establish this judgment (see p. lviii, note 1, and pp. lxiii, lxiv, 65, 73 f., 86, 109, 140 f., 236 ff., 260 ff., 271 f., 276 ff., 280, 284 f., and, indeed, *passim*). In thus returning to the Marcan framework of the Lucan gospel Professor Creed does not intend to deny the possibility that Q may have been combined with some of Luke's special material before it came into his hands (see the last sentence of the note on p. lviii). Still less does he intend to deny the importance of the special Lucan material which he thinks may be "largely derived from Palestinian sources"; and he treats the conjecture of its Cæsarean *provenance* as "at least attractive" (p. lxx). The commentary, however, raises in an acute form the question as to the nature of Lucan editing and the problem as to whether indeed there were any limits to what Luke could make of a Marcan passage (see the preface to the notes on the Healing of the Ten Lepers, pp. 216 f.). It is difficult to discover precisely what Professor Creed really thinks about Lucan editing, since the relevant passage in the introduction (pp. lvi-lxiv) does not cover what is demanded in the commentary. Since so much of the commentary is concerned directly or indirectly with the Proto-Luke hypothesis, it would have been convenient to have had the evidence against it gathered together in a detached note. The footnote on p. lviii hardly represents the importance of the issue for English scholars, nor does it give any indication of how much of the commentary is concerned with this particular problem.

It will be seen that Professor Creed is mainly concerned with the technique of criticism rather than with major questions of theology or of history. But the two cannot be disentangled, since critical matters have theological and historical implications; and it is a considerable convenience to the reader when these implications are clearly stated and handled with the same rigorous criticism as are matters of literary criticism. Throughout this commentary there is, however, a certain shyness in handling theological and historical problems which is difficult to explain. The book remains tentative and incomplete except for those who are working primarily upon literary or linguistic



problems. The few pages devoted in the introduction to "Theological Ideas" (pp. lxxi-lxxv) illustrate this incompleteness. The reader is therefore quite unprepared for the occasional sudden intrusion into the commentary of theological and historical judgments which seem to hang in the air and to be without any critical defence. One illustration will suffice to illustrate these sudden "bolts from the blue." The Professor is commenting on the Logion, *The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins*; and with great care he argues against those who suppose that "Son of man" here means "man" used generically, and decides its meaning to be that "Jesus as the divine Son of Man represents God and can forgive sins." At the end of the note there is, however, introduced an almost thoroughgoing historical scepticism—he writes: "It is impossible to reconstruct with security the words which Jesus used. Nathan pronounced absolution upon David (2 Sam. xii. 13). A similar prophetic absolution on the part of Jesus would be likely to arouse the antagonism of the Scribes, and this may lie at the foundation of this narrative of controversy, which, as it stands, is a later literary growth." Such a judgment rests surely upon something which goes beyond historical or literary criticism. Professor Creed by implication raises the whole question of the Messiahship of Jesus, and dismisses it, here at least, in terms of prophecy. But the implications are not stated or discussed. It seems, though it is extremely difficult to be certain, that in the end Professor Creed is satisfied that the estimate of the person of Jesus in the Gospels "had its origin in the impression which he made upon his followers both before and after his death." But the gospels, when subjected to a most rigorous critical analysis, demand that clear teaching was given to the disciples, and that their faith rested upon something more than an "impression," however overwhelming that impression may have been. And yet, we must not demand from Professor Creed more than he has intended to give. He did not set out to reconstruct the teaching of Jesus: he set out to comment upon Luke's account of the Ministry, and he has given us a commentary which is of very great critical importance.

EDWYN C. HOSKYNs.



## NOTICES

**DIVERS ORDERS OF MINISTERS.** By W. Lockton. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

This very remarkable and original book begins by sketching the ministry and organization of Judaism. "The high priest and the prophet" of Josephus (*Ant.* IV. viii. 14) refer to the same person. "The prophet like unto me" of Deuteronomy refers to a prophet-priest, "the founder of a new high priestly dynasty." The Sanhedrin of 70 members acted through a Committee of 12 regarded as the right number for an embassy (*Ant.* XX. viii. 11). The lesser Sanhedrins outside Jerusalem consisted of seven principal men; there were also seven bursars of the Temple. Jerusalem had metropolitical authority. We must also notice "the disciples of the wise," an order of young men.

All these institutions reappear in the primitive Church. Jesus appointed a Council of 70, within which there was a smaller circle of 12. Thus "He founds a new dynasty of priests." The young man who waited at the Last Supper, deduced from Luke xxii., was the first of the Christian "disciples of the wise" who are seen in the "young men" of Acts. The prophets in Acts are simply the Christian elders or priests; Luke never thought of explaining to Theophilus an identification which to him was obvious. The apostles and elders at Jerusalem in Acts xv. are two grades in the one supreme order of the Mother Church. The key to the perplexing problems which confront us a little later is found in recognition of the fact that in the metropolitical Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome and Alexandria, elders or bishops ranked as apostles, and deacons had the rank of elders in the local churches.

This may sound wild. None the less the theory deserves careful study. The Jewish part is fully documented and facts are incontrovertible (not all the deductions, perhaps). In the later Church this organization reappears in large measure. There is an overwhelming probability that the earlier state of things is responsible for the later development. Mr. Lockton states his case in a challenging, provocative way. Whether his book will receive the attention it deserves, I do not know. Probably many who ought to read it will ignore its existence. But eventually it is sure to be discovered and its main thesis will be restated judicially by a scholar more pedestrian, perhaps, but more sensitive to the complexities of the problem, which have led to a bewildering number of theories.

If I may illustrate the weaknesses of the book, I would note first that the whole New Testament is taken at its face value, no regard being paid to varying degrees of historical authority. To identify presbyters and prophets is cutting the knot instead of unravelling it. It is arbitrary, in view of the figurative use of *λειτουργεῖν* and its compounds elsewhere, to say that "ministering unto the Lord" in Acts xiii. 2 must be sacerdotal. The Council at Jerusalem is called a meeting of the Sanhedrin of the new people of God, James being the high priest. Such a view is impossible to reconcile with the relations of the Christians to Judaism in Acts xxi. The difference between the style of the Pastorals and of the other Pauline Epistles is ascribed to the difference of the locality in which they were written, though the very name *Koinē* should show the danger of using such an argument. Every few pages some judgment as irritating as these will be found. But the critical faculty thus set in operation will discover many valuable truths entirely missing in Canon Streeter's widely read book on the ministry.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.



**THE SACRAMENTARY (LIBER SACRAMENTORUM): HISTORICAL AND LITURGICAL NOTES ON THE ROMAN MISSAL.** By Ildefonso Schuster. Vol. v. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s.

This volume concludes Dom Schuster's great work, and he is to be highly congratulated on the rapid completion of so formidable a task. Like the previous volumes the present one consists mainly of a detailed commentary on the actual text of the Missal, but begins with an introduction on a subject of general liturgical interest. The latter, in this volume, consists of chapters on the Roman sanctuaries and portraits of the Blessed Virgin, and on the feast of her Assumption in the ancient Roman liturgy. It is difficult, even with a passionate desire for a sympathetic understanding of a great Roman Catholic teacher, not to feel restive in the face of his Mariology. The very idea of Our Lady seems (at least to those trained in a different school) to induce in the Roman mind a kind of hypnotic suspension of the critical faculty. It can turn a professor into a sentimentalist, and lead a severe liturgist to lisp like an *enfant de Marie*. Even Dom Schuster is not altogether immune. He affirms that it is "hardly wise" to speak of a development of a devotion to Our Lady since the fourth century! Nor can he altogether resist the temptation to indulge in the frigid ecstasies of the conventional language of devotion. He provides a solemn list of Madonnas which have wept or "moved their eyes." What is more serious, when speaking of the possibility of dogmatic definition of the Assumption, he tells us that "Catholic devotion anticipates the day when the infallible Teacher of Truth will place this last gem in the diadem which adorns Our Lady in Heaven."

The notes on the Kalendar are very full of information, some of which are of great interest. Anglicans do not always realize that the new festival of the Kingship of Christ was instituted as a condemnation of "a pernicious heresy . . . which some call liberalism and others laicism. . . . This error has many aspects, but consists chiefly in the denial of the supremacy of God and the Church over Society and the State." The privilege which Benedict XV. granted to all priests of saying three Masses on All Souls' Day was prompted partly by the "useless slaughter" of the Great War, but partly also by the fact that the numerous confiscations of Church property had brought to an end many benefactions which were intended to pay for Requiem Masses. For the latter reason one of the three Masses of All Souls' Day must always be offered in satisfaction for the non-fulfilment of legacies devoted to this purpose.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

**THE TREASURY OF THE FAITH: XIX., THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST; XXIII., THE SACRAMENT OF CONFIRMATION; XXVIII., EXTREME UNCTION; XXIX., THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD; XXXVI., A KEY TO THE TREASURY.** Burns Oates and Washbourne. 1s. each.

The index volume concludes this useful series. A few notes on the concluding volumes follow. In XIX. Mgr. Myers deprecates the custom of insisting on the "good faith" of those out of communion with Rome, which undermines the traditional horror of heresy. Our people, he says, often ask why "when Our Lord is already present in the Tabernacle, such a great manifestation of reverence should surround the Consecration," not understanding the doctrine of the Sacrifice. The Church has suffered much by developing its teaching on polemical anti-Protestant lines rather



than constructively. In XXIII. Mgr. Kolbe tells us that, though the *immediate* institution of Confirmation by Our Lord is not *de fide*, any theologian who denied it would "probably soon hear from the authorities"; he himself is inclined to put the institution in the forty days after the Resurrection. The privilege of conferring Confirmation is given to priests "as a matter of routine in mission countries where there are Vicariates instead of Dioceses and where consequently the 'Ordinary' is a Prelate but not a Bishop." Dr. Arendzen's book on Extreme Unction, which he derives from James v., is to a non-Roman Catholic a piece of special pleading. Canon Cronin in XXIX. interprets Acts xiii. 1-3 as the "episcopal ordination" of Paul and Barnabas. An interesting discussion of the *porrectio instrumentorum* shows that "the imposition of hands with the invocation of the Holy Ghost" is the matter and form of ordination to the Episcopate, Priesthood, and Diaconate. Anglican Orders were condemned because of heretical intention, shown by the leaving out of words expressing "the order or its power and grace."

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NOTES ON THE CATHOLIC LITURGIES. By Archdale A. King. Longmans. 21s.

This is the first volume of a very full and elaborate account of all the liturgies now in use with the sanction of the Roman See. It contains in Part I. a short account of the Roman rite, which is followed by a detailed history and description of the derived rites of the Carthusians, Dominicans and Carmelites, of the Romano-Gallican rites of Lyon and Braga, and of the Ambrosian and Mozarabic liturgies. Part II., the first two chapters of which are included in this volume, is devoted to the Oriental rites, and contains a short history of the various Uniate groups who use them.

The author writes as a convinced Papalist. This intriguing sentence occurs on almost the first page: "It is historically certain, as well as being theologically true, that St. Peter . . . governed the Church of Rome as chief shepherd and ruler of the faithful." The Orthodox are schismatics. Anglicans are unnoticed except for one or two pleasantries. Rome, we are reminded only too often, is "Mother and Mistress of churches." But the book is an invaluable storehouse of information. Mr. Archdale King has evidently taken immense trouble with it. He has been in touch with the best authorities, and has witnessed many of the rites which he describes. But while it is so good, it might easily in one respect have been very much better. The literary style is very unpleasing. On almost every page there is a roughness, or a queer phrase, or a bit of turgid writing. The real excellence of the matter deserved a better form.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

THE GOSPEL FOUNDATIONS. By J. S. Hart, Bishop of Wangaratta. S.P.C.K. 5s.

The Church is only beginning to face out the problems involved in the modern critical attitude towards the New Testament. It is remarkable that a contribution towards this task, of the character of the Moorhouse Lectures contained in this book, should be received from a diocese in Australia, the very name of which is unfamiliar to most Englishmen. The fact does credit to the Anglican communion. What is important in



this volume is not so much the actual conclusions as the method of scholarship and investigation by which they are reached. The whole line of approach is frankly modern. The writer is familiar with the results of recent scholarship and has the ability to put them before the general public. We must own that we are not convinced by the arguments put forward to support many of his positions—*e.g.*, the early date of St. Mark's Gospel. But on other points where he parts company with the prevailing critical opinion we believe that he calls attention to points that have been unduly neglected. We hope that this book will be widely read, especially in circles that do not read technical theological works. It will help educated laymen to understand how devout Christians approach the problems of Gospel history in the light of modern knowledge. Too many still suppose that there is no alternative between an acceptance of the literal accuracy of the records in all their details and a wholesale scepticism. This volume should point them to better things.

E. J. BICKNELL.

---

THE BIBLE AS LITERATURE. By Kathleen E. Innes. Jonathan Cape. 6s.

The aim of this work is twofold: the enrichment of the knowledge of those who do know their Bible, and the introduction to its riches of those who don't. Success will rather depend on which chapter the reader, of either class, begins with. The chapters on Job, the Song of Songs, the Gospels, and St. Paul's Epistles are very good. The rest are inadequate and inclined to be dull. The two chapters which deal with the Prophets are not only sketchy but sufficient to "put off" any reader. As a whole the book is not compellingly written—it resembles the kind of textbook welcomed by those faced with preliminary examinations. If the outsider does read it through he is likely to leave matters there, instead of being led to explore the Bible for himself. Some of the inadequacy is inevitable: the Bible is great literature, but it is, humanly speaking, only accidentally so. It cannot be treated as pure literature can be legitimately treated—the whole motive, explicit and implicit, is utterly different from that underlying any other literature. To ignore this, even with the best intentions, is to render it largely meaningless.

V. I. RUFFER.

---

SCIENCE REDISCOVERS GOD. By R. C. Macfie. T. and T. Clark. 7s. 6d.

This is a fascinating description of the present state of scientific research. The writer declares that Darwinism is moribund; men are not descended from monkeys but from tree-shrews. He lays great stress on the different conditions that prevailed when life emerged. The first water was the condensed steam ejected by volcanoes—in which, apparently, anything might have happened. There is nothing theological until the end, when in effect Dr. Macfie says: "How wonderful it all is, there must be a God!" We heartily agree, but the real problem, what is implied by the word God, he never faces. And the suggestion that some descendant of a lizard or fish "may one day quite outstrip man" is made without reflecting on its theological bearings. In a magazine devoted to theology a reviewer must point out the theological limitations of a book. Apart from this, it deserves the highest praise, and can be read with extreme pleasure.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.



# INDEX OF VOLUME XXII

JANUARY—JUNE, 1931

	PAGE
BINSTEAD, Mrs. . . . .	280
Books Reviewed:	
Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1930, Report . . . . .	296
Carthusian Order in England. By E. M. Thompson . . . . .	229
Chester Miracle Plays. Arranged by I. and O. Bolton King . . . . .	119
Christ in the Gospels. By B. S. Easton . . . . .	230
Confirmation School, The. By A. R. Browne-Wilkinson . . . . .	112
Digging up Biblical History. By J. Garrow Duncan . . . . .	236
Divers Orders of Ministries. By W. Lockton . . . . .	355
Ecclesia Anglicana. By G. F. Pollard . . . . .	225
Eucharistic Canon, The. By J. Blomfield . . . . .	298
Eucharistic Faith and Practice. By Y. Brilioth . . . . .	174
Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion, The. Edited by A. J. Macdonald . . . . .	232
Exercises for the Spiritual Life, Book of. By G. de Cisnews . . . . .	118
Faith of a Moralist, The. By A. E. Taylor . . . . .	289
Flight from Reason, The. By Arnold Lunn . . . . .	218
Fullness of Sacrifice, The. By Bishop Hicks . . . . .	54
God in Christian Thought and Experience. By W. R. Matthews . . . . .	51
Good Estate of the Catholic Church, The. By Viscount Halifax . . . . .	114
Grace of God, The. By N. P. Williams . . . . .	49
Historia Ecclesiastica de España. By Z. G. Villada . . . . .	222
Historic Jesus, The. By J. Mackinnon . . . . .	347
History of the Creeds. By F. J. Badcock . . . . .	178
Iconoclastic Controversy, History of the. By E. J. Martin . . . . .	237
Inner History of the Great Schism, The. By G. J. Jordan . . . . .	178
Irish Visions of the Other-World. By St. J. D. Seymour . . . . .	235
Karl Barth, The Teaching of. By R. Birch Hoyle . . . . .	55
Literary History of Religious Thought in France (Vol. II.). By H. Bremond . . . . .	231
Luke, The Gospel of. By W. Manson . . . . .	349
Luke, The Gospel according to St. By H. Balmforth . . . . .	349
Luke, The Gospel according to St. By J. M. Creed . . . . .	349
Luther and the Reformation (Vol. IV.). By J. Mackinnon . . . . .	176
Man and his Religion. By S. P. T. Prideaux . . . . .	116
Metareligiöse, Das. By O. Bauhofer . . . . .	226
Mönchtum und die evangelische Kirche, Das. By F. Parpert . . . . .	58
Monument to St. Augustine, A. Various . . . . .	107
Mysterium Christi. Various . . . . .	44
Prayer Book, Introduction to. By F. W. Vroom . . . . .	50
Psychology and God. By L. W. Grensted . . . . .	41
Religion and the Mysterious. By F. H. Brabant . . . . .	111
Religion and the Reign of Science. By F. L. Cross . . . . .	110
Reminiscences and Reflections. By H. Kingsmill Moore . . . . .	60
Richard Rolle. Selected Works . . . . .	53
Robert Leighton. By the Right Rev. A. E. Knox . . . . .	234
Selected Poems of W. and C. F. Alexander . . . . .	226
Sense of Glory, The. By Herbert Read . . . . .	57
Short Notices . . . . .	237
Sign of Faith, The. By P. Carrington . . . . .	112
Six Great Missionaries. By David Jenks . . . . .	297
Testament of Paul, The. By J. E. Rattenbury . . . . .	112
Treasury of the Faith (new vols.) . . . . .	114, 358
Validity of Anglican Ordinations. By Mgr. Papadopoulos . . . . .	299
Veracity and Value of the Old Testament, The. By J. Stephenson . . . . .	180
Virgin Birth of Christ, The. By J. G. Machen . . . . .	220
BAUHOFFER, O. . . . .	339
BULLOCK, Miss E. M. . . . .	264
BURY, P. . . . .	271
CARNGEIE, Canon . . . . .	165
Centrality of the Holy Eucharist . . . . .	75
Conference of German and English Theologians . . . . .	302
CHANDLER, Bishop . . . . .	289
CLARKE, W. K. L. . . . .	214
Concelebration . . . . .	64
Conflict of Jesus with Unclean Spirits . . . . .	122
Correspondence . . . . .	280
CREED, Professor . . . . .	302



	PAGE
DAVEY, N.	347
Defence of Hunting, In	280
DODD, Professor	333
Donne the Preacher.	155
Donne's Religious Development	144
DUNCAN, Professor G. S.	16
Early Passion Play, An	135
ECK, Prebendary	183
Editorial	1, 61, 121, 181, 241
FEIDRICHSEN, Professor	122
GUY, D. S.	82
HARDY, T. J.	75
HEBERT, A. G.	64
HOSKYNs, Sir E. C.	250
House that Jeans Built, The	311, 354
HUDSON, C. E.	41
HUTCHINSON, F. E.	155
In Praise of Beauty	264
Lambeth Conference Reviews	36, 98, 165
LE MESSURIER	187
Liturgica	214
MASCALL, E. L.	203
Memorial of the Apostles	90
MILNER-WHITE, E.	216
Miscellanea	34, 98, 164, 214
MORTIMER, E. C.	250
MOZLEY, Canon	36, 220, 313
NAYLOR, E. W.	135
Notes and Comments	34, 164, 214
NUNN, H. P. V.	90
On Giving of Penance	187
OSBORNE, H.	9
Periodicals, Notes on	102, 283
Personality and the Holy Communion	82
PHILLIPS, Deaconess M.	171
Popish Convert, A	260
POETER, W. S.	222
QUICK, Canon	174
RAWLINSON, Archdeacon	98, 323
Recent Light on the Flood	9
Religion and Politics in Alsace	271
Religious Community, The	1
Religious Experience	23
Resurrection, The	192
Resurrection, Nature of the	203
SASSE, H.	318
SCHMIDT, Professor K. L.	304
St. Paul at Ephesus.	16
SELWYN, Dean	1, 61, 181, 192, 241 301, 336
SHEBBEARE, C. J.	2, 282
SHOLOVSKY, Mme.	242
Soloviev's Easter Letters	242
SPARROW, J.	144
SPARROW SIMPSON, W. J.	107
STÄHLIN, Professor	328
Studies in Texts	34
SYKES, N.	260
VALENTINE, C. H.	23
Video Meliora	183
WADDAMS, C. D.	218
WILLIAMS, Professor N. P.	44



